



# भारत का राजपत्र

## The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित  
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 44]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, नवम्बर 2, 1974/कार्तिक 11, 1896

No. 44] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1974/KARTIKA 11, 1896

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

### भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

### PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)

केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गये सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India

(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities

(other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

आदेश

ORDERS

नई दिल्ली 19 सितम्बर, 1974

New Delhi, the 19th September, 1974

क्र०प्रा० 2835—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए गांधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 160-बालाघाट निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री पंचम, ग्राम जागपुर, पो० भान्डी (पिपरिया) तहसील बरगियां, जिला बालाघाट लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदुक्त बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अधिष्ठित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अधिकांश स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायचित्य नहीं है।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री पंचम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरन्तर घोषित करता है।

S.O. 2835.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Pancham, Village Jagpur, Post Bhandi (Piparia) Tahsil Waraseoni, District Balaghat who was a contesting candidate for election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 160-Balaghat constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Pancham to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[सं०प्र०-वि०सं०/160/72(49)]

[No. MP-LA/160/72(49)]

का०प्रा० 2836—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 97-तखतपुर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मंगन राम, गांव तथा पोस्ट सेमरतल, तहसील और जिला बिलामपुर लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तब्दीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मंगन राम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं०प्र०-वि०स०/97/72(54)]

S.O. 2836.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mangatram; Village and Post Semartal, Tahsil and District Bilaspur who was a contesting candidate for election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 97-Tkhatpur constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mangatram to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP-LA/97/72(54)]

का०प्रा० 2837—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 169-पनागर निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री प्रेमलाल कोल, ग्राम रिछाई, ब्लौकल फैक्ट्री जबलपुर लोकप्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम 1951 तथा तब्दीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री प्रेमलाल कोल को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं०प्र०-वि०स०/169/72(48)]

S.O. 2837.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Premlal Kol, Village Richhai, Vehicle Factory, Jabalpur, District Jabalpur who was a contesting candidate from election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 169-Panagar constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Premlal Kol to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP-LA/169/72(48)]

का०प्रा० 2838—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 152-दुमका (अ०ज०जा०) निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री हेमन्त हेमरम, ग्राम बड़तली, पो० गान्दो, संथाल परगना लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तब्दीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं, और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री हेमन्त हेमरम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि०स०/152/72(152)]

S.O. 2838.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Hemant Hemrom, Village Bartali, P. O. Gando, Santhal Parganas who was a contesting candidate for election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from 152-Dumka (ST) constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder ;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Hemant Hemrom to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-1A/152/72(152)]

क्रा०प्रा० 2839.—यत्, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 166-बंका निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री जगदम्बा मंडल, ग्राम मालडीह, पो० करंजा, जिला भागलपुर लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा प्रपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे है,

और यत्, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्बन्ध सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री जगदम्बा मंडल का संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवेदन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि०सं०/166/72 (115)]

S.O. 2839.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Jagdamba Mandal, Village Maldih, P. O. Karanja, District Bhagalpur who was a contesting candidate for election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from 166-Banka constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Jagdamba Mandal to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this Order.

[No. BR-LA/166/72(115)]

क्रा०प्रा० 2840.—यत्, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 153-अमा (अ०ज०जा०) निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री मुंशी बेसरा, ग्राम लकड़जोरिया, पो० चिकनिया, संथाल परगना लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा प्रपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे है,

और, यत्, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्बन्ध सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री मुंशी बेसरा को, संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवेदन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि०सं०/153/72(117)]

S.O. 2840.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Munshi Besra, Village Lakarjoria, P.O. Chikanla, Santhal Parganas who was a contesting candidate for election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from 153 Janta (ST) constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Munshi Besra to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/153/72(117)]

क्रा०प्रा० 2841.—यत्, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 170-जबलपुर छावनी निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री विद्या प्रसाद शर्मा, 348 बेहार निवास, सथीहा कुआँ जबलपुर लोक प्रतिनिधित्व, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा प्रपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे है,

और, यत्, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्बन्ध सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री विद्या प्रसाद शर्मा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आवेदन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० म०प्र०-वि०सं०/170/72(46)]

S.O. 2841.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Vidya Prasad Sharma, 348 Beohar Niwas, Sathiyha Kuwa, Jabalpur, District Jabalpur who was a contesting candidate for election to the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly from 170-Jabalpur Cantonment constituency held in March, 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Vidya Prasad Sharma to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP-LA/170/72(46)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 21 सितम्बर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2842—यत्, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए मणिपुर विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 42-तेगनोपाल (अ० ज० जा०) निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री थोंगुल, यांगु बुंग ग्राम, बी० पी० ओ० टी० बौगमोल तेगनोपाल उपखण्ड मणिपुर, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं।

और, यत्, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री थोंगुल को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० मणि० वि० सं०/42/72]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 21st September, 1974

S.O. 2842.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Thongul, Yangoubung Village, B.P.O.T. Bongmol, Tengnoupal Sub-Division, (Manipur) a contesting candidate for general election to the Manipur Legislative Assembly held in March, 1972 from 42 Tengnoupal (ST) constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Thongul to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MR-LA/42/72]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2843—यत्, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए असम विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 43-बोनगई गांव निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बिनय राय, बोनगई-गांव, वार्ड नं० 1 पो० प्रा० बोनगईगांव, जिला गोनपारा (आसाम) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यत्, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिये कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री बिनय राय को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० म० वि० सं०/43/72]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th September, 1974

S.O. 2843.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Benoy Roy Bonggaon, Ward No. 1, P. O. Bonggaon, District Goalpara (Assam), a contesting candidate for general election to the Assam Legislative Assembly held in March, 1972, from 43-Bongaigaon constituency has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notice, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Benoy Roy to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order;

[No. AS-LA/43/72]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 14 अक्टूबर 1974

का० प्रा० 2844—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 43) की धारा 13-क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, निर्वाचन आयोग हरियाणा सरकार के परामर्श से, श्री एन० एन० कश्यप के स्थान पर श्री एस० डी० भाम्बरी, मुख्य सचिव तथा सचिव, गृह, निर्वाचन तथा अन्य विभाग, हरियाणा सरकार को तारीख 20 सितम्बर, 1974 के अपराह्न से अगले आदेशों तक हरियाणा सरकार के मुख्य निर्वाचन आफिसर के रूप में एतद्वारा नाम निर्देशित करता है।

[सं० 154/हरि०/74]

सचिव, ए० एन० सेन

ORDER

New Delhi, the 14th October, 1974

S.O. 2844.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission of India, in consultation with the Government of Haryana, hereby nominates Shri S. D. Bhambri, Chief Secretary and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Home, Elections and other Departments as the Chief Electoral Officer for the State of Haryana, with effect from the afternoon of the 30th September, 1974 and until further orders vice Shri N. N. Kashyap.

[No. 154/HN/74]

A. N. SEN, Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, दिनांक, 27 सितम्बर, 1974

का० आ० 2845—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए राजस्थान विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 39-गांधीनगर निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री अब्दुल रफ, ग्राम भोजपुरा, कय-विक्रम संघ के पाम, केनाल बाई के सामने कच्ची बस्ती, जयपुर, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदर्थान बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्पक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण प्रयत्न स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा, 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री अब्दुल रफ की संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा प्रथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० राज०वि०सं०/32/92(43)]

बी० नागसुब्रमण्यम, सचिव

#### ORDER

New Delhi the 27th September, 1974

**S.O. 2845.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Abdul Rahoof, Village Bhojpura, Near Kray Vikray Sangh, Opposite Canal Board, Kachi Basti, Jaipur (Rajasthan), a contesting candidate for General Elections to the Rajasthan Legislative Assembly from 39-Gandhi Nagar held in March, 1972 Constituency has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas, the said candidate even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

3. Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Abdul Rahoof to be disqualified for being chosen as and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. RJ-LA/39/72(43)]

V. NAGASUBRAMANIAN, Secy.

विधि, न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(कम्पनी कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, दिनांक, 15 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० आ० 2846—एकधिकार एवं निबन्धनकारी व्यापार प्रथा अधिनियम, 1969 (1969 का 54) की धारा 28 की उप-धारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा सैमर्स शेखावासी

इन्डस्ट्रीज लि० के कथित अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत पंजीकरण (पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 380/70 दिनांक 27-10-1970) के निरस्तीकरण को अधिसूचित करती है।

[फ० सं० 2/9/64-एम० 2]

कान्त मणि शर्मा, अवसर सचिव,

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS  
(Department of Company Affairs)

New Delhi, the 15th October, 1974

**S.O. 2846.**—In pursuance of sub-section (3) of Section 26 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1959 (54 of 1969), the Central Government hereby notifies the cancellation of the registration of M/s. Seshasayce Industries Limited under the said Act (Certificate of Registration No. 380/70 dated the 27-10-1970).

[F. No. 2/9/74-M. II.]

K. M. SHARMA, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, दिनांक 15 सितम्बर, 1974

आयकर

का० आ० 2847—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि निम्न वर्णित संस्था को वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसंधान परिषद्, विहित प्राधिकारी, राज आयाकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए अनुमोदित किया गया है। यह अधिसूचना 1 अप्रैल, 1974 से प्रभावी है।

—किर्तिमान सिंह नेमाडेजी, अवर सचिव।

[सं० 717/फार्म० 203/60/74-आई०टी०ए०-2]

टी० पी० ज़ुनज़ुनवाला, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue & Insurance)

New Delhi, the 19th September, 1974

Income Tax

**S.O. 2847.**—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961. This notification is effective from 1st April, 1974.

INSTITUTION

Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad.

[No. 717/F. No. 203/60/74-ITA-II]

T. P. JHUNJHUNWALA, Dy. Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 नवम्बर, 1974

प्रारूप

का० प्रा० 2848—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रयुक्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उस शुल्क से, जो जम्मू और कश्मीर विद्युत बोर्ड द्वारा जारी किये जाने वाले चार करोड़ बारह लाख पचास हजार रुपए के मूल्य के 6-1/4 प्रतिशत जम्मू और कश्मीर विद्युत बोर्ड बन्धपत्र, 1984 पर उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन प्रसार्य है छूट देती है।

[सं० 28/74-स्टाम्प/का० सं० 471/49/74-सीमा शुल्क-7]

जे० रामकृष्णन, अवर सचिव

### ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd November, 1974

### STAMPS

**S.O. 2848.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the 6-1/4 per cent Jammu and Kashmir Electricity Board Bonds 1984 to the value of four crores twelve lakhs fifty thousand rupees, to be issued by the Jammu and Kashmir Electricity Board, are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 28/74-Stamps/F.No. 471/49/74-Cus. VII]

J. RAMAKRISHNAN, Under Secy.

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1974

**S.O. 2849.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution and after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1972, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Central Civil Services (Pension) (Sixth Amendment) Rules, 1974.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1972, in rule 54, in sub-rule (6), the following proviso shall be inserted, namely :—

“Provided that if the son or daughter of a Government servant is suffering from any disorder or disability of mind or is physically crippled or disabled so as to render him or her unable to earn a living even after attaining the age of 18 years in the case of the son and 21 years in the case of the daughter, the family pension shall be payable to such son or daughter for life subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(i) if such son or daughter in one among two or more children of the Government servant, the family pension shall be initially payable to the minor children in the order set out in clause (iii) of sub-rule (8) of this rule until the last minor child attains the age of 18 or 21, as the case may be, and thereafter the family pension shall be resumed in favour of the son or daughter suffering from disorder or disability of mind or who is physically crippled or disabled and shall be payable to him/her for life;

(ii) if there are more than one such son or daughter suffering from disorder or disability of mind or who are physically crippled or disabled, the family pension shall be paid in the following order, namely :—

(a) firstly to the son, and if there are more than one son, the younger of them will get the family pension only after the lifetime of the elder;

(b) secondly, to the daughter, and if there are more than one daughter, the younger of them will get the family pension only after the lifetime of the elder;

(iii) the family pension shall be paid to such son or daughter through the guardian as if he or she were a minor;

(iv) before allowing the family pension for life to any such son or daughter the sanctioning authority shall satisfy that the handicap is of such a nature as to prevent him or her from earning his or her livelihood and the same shall be evidenced by a certificate obtained from a medical officer not below the rank of a Civil Surgeon setting out, as far as possible, the exact mental or physical condition of the child;

(v) the person receiving the family pension as guardian of such son or daughter shall produce every three years a certificate from a medical officer not below the rank of a Civil Surgeon to the effect that he or she continues to suffer from disorder or disability of mind or continues to be physically crippled or disabled.

[No. 1(3)-EV(B)/74]

V. K. PANDIT, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 3rd October, 1974

**S.O. 2850.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution and of all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the President, after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General of India in respect of persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department hereby makes the following rules further to amend the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules, 1960, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Eighth Amendment Rules, 1974.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules, 1960, in rule 31, after Explanation-III, the following proviso shall be inserted, namely :—

“Provided that the amount of subscription, together with interest thereon, of a subscriber opting for service under a public Enterprise may, if he so desires, be transferred to his new Provident Fund Account under the Enterprise if the concerned Enterprise also agrees to such a transfer. If however, the subscriber does not desire the transfer or the concerned Enterprise does not operate a Provident Fund, the amount aforesaid shall be refunded to the subscriber.”

[No. F. 13(3)-E.V.(B)/74 (GPF)]

New Delhi, the 5th October, 1974

**S.O. 2851.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution and of all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the President after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General of India in respect of persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Contributory Provident Fund (India) Rules, 1962, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Contributory Provident Fund (India) Fourth Amendment Rules, 1974.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Contributory Provident Fund (India) Rules, 1962, in rule 33 after Explanation-III, the following proviso shall be inserted, namely :—

"Provided the amount of subscriptions and the Government contribution together with interest thereon, of a subscriber opting for service under a public Enterprise may, if he so desires be transferred to his new Provident Fund Account under the Enterprise if the concerned Enterprises also agrees to such a transfer. If, however, the subscriber does not desire the transfer or the concerned Enterprise does not operate a Provident Fund, the amount aforesaid shall be refunded to the subscriber."

[No. F. 13(3)-E.V.(B)/74(CPF)]  
V. K. PANDIT, Dy. Secy

रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया

नई दिल्ली, 11 अक्टूबर, 1974

क्र०आ० 2852.—रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसर्ग में अक्टूबर, 1974 की 1 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा (इण्ड विभाग)

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तियाँ	रुपये	रुपये
1	2	3	4	5	6
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट	21,36,67,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन —		
संचयन में नोट	59,58,03,83,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,05,000	
जारी किये गये कुछ नोट		59,79,46,50,000	(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियाँ	141,73,97,000	
			जोड़		324,27,02,000
			रुपये का सिक्का		19,36,89,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियाँ		56,35,82,59,000
			विदेशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र		
कुल देयताएं		59,79,46,50,000	कुल आस्तियाँ		59,79,46,50,000

तारीख 9 अक्टूबर 1974

एस० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर

4 अक्टूबर 1974 को रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्तियाँ	रुपये
1	2	3	4
चुक्का पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	21,36,67,000
भारक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	3,83,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि	284,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का	3,22,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्वीकृति) निधि	95,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल	
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि	265,00,00,000	(क) देशी	142,17,84,000
जमा राशियाँ		(ख) विदेशी	
(क) सरकारी		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल	652,48,70,000
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	59,16,11,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया*	466,07,94,000
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	32,43,00,000	निवेश **	324,22,29,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अधिम —	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	574,13,43,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	14,79,08,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को	30,21,79,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	1,45,98,000	ऋण और अधिम —	
(iv) अन्य बैंक	1,60,41,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को	95,39,80,000
		(ii) राज्य सरकारी बैंकों को	255,91,29,000
		(iii) दूसरों को	6,55,00,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से ऋण अधिम और निवेश	
		(क) ऋण और अधिम —	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	67,82,39,000
		(ii) राज्य सरकारी बैंकों को	14,82,57,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त निगम को	64,00,00,000

वैयत्ताए	रुपये	भास्तियाँ	रुपये
1	2	3	4
(ग) अन्य	371,26,78,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिखन्धक बैंकों के डिपॉजिटों में निवेश राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और भ्रमिम	11,27,48,000
वेय बिल	118,10,86,000	राज्य महकारी बैंकों को ऋण और भ्रमिम राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से	47,68,17,000
अन्य देयताएँ	538,55,38,000	ऋण, भ्रमिम, और निवेश (क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और भ्रमिम (ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बाडों/डिबें- चरों में निवेश	219,05,57,000
		अन्य भास्तियाँ	91,36,48,000
रुपये	25,10,51,03,000	रुपये	25,10,51,03,000

\* नकदी, आबधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियाँ शामिल हैं।

\*\* राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

† राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और भ्रमिम शामिल नहीं हैं; परन्तु राज्य सरकारों को दिये गये अस्थायी ओवर-ड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

‡ रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17(4)(ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों की मियादी बिलों पर भ्रमिम दिये गये 18,72,00,000/रुपये शामिल हैं।

†† राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और भ्रमिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

एस० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर

ता० 9 अक्टूबर, 1974

### RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 11th October, 1974

S. O. 2852.—An account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 4th day of October, 1974

### ISSUE DEPARTMENT

Liabilities	Rs.	Rs.	Assets	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	21,36,67,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation	59,58,09,83,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,05,000	
			(b) Held outside India	..	
			Foreign Securities	141,73,97,000	
Total Notes issued		5979,46,50,000			
			Total		324,27,02,000
			Rupee Coin		19,36,89,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		56,35,82,59,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other Commercial paper		..
Total Liabilities		59,79,46,50,000	Total Assets		59,79,46,50,000

S. JAGANNATHAN, Governor

Dated the 9th October, 1974



New Delhi, the 11th October, 1974

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 4th October, 1974

Liabilities	Rs.	Assets	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	21,36,67,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupee Ccin	3,83,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.	284,00,00,000	Small Coin	3,22,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	95,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.	265,00,00,000	(a) Internal	142,17,84,000
Deposits :—		(b) External	
(e) Government		(c) Government Treasury Bills	652,48,70,000
(i) Central Government	59,16,11,000	Balances Held Abroad*	466,07,94,000
(ii) State Governments	32,43,00,000	Investments**	324,22,29,000
(b) Banks		Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	574,13,43,000	(i) Central Government	
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	14,79,08,000	(ii) State Governments <sup>(a)</sup>	30,21,79,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Cooperative Banks.	1,45,98,000	Loans and Advances to :—	
(iv) Other Banks	1,60,41,000	(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	95,39,80,000
(c) Others	371,26,78,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	255,91,29,000
Bills Payable	118,10,86,000	(iii) Others	6,55,00,000
Other Liabilities	538,55,38,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.	
		(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) State Governments	67,82,39,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	14,82,57,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	
		(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation	64,00,00,000
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures.	11,27,48,000
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.	
		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	47,68,17,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank.	219,05,57,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank.	..
		Other Assets	91,36,48,000
	Rupees 2510,51,03,000		Rupees 2510,51,03,000

\*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

\*\*Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 18,72,00,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17 (4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 9th day of October, 1974

S. Jagannathan, Governor

नई दिल्ली, 17 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० आ० 2853.—रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में अक्टूबर, 1974 की 11 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सन्दाह के लिए लेखा

(इसू विभाग)

वेवसाए	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तियाँ	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए मोट	26,85,52,000		सोने का मिक्का और बुलियन :—		
संचलन में मोट	6031,48,55,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,05,000	
			(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ	..	
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियाँ	141,73,97,000	
जारी किये गये कुल मोट		6058,34,07,000	जोड		324,27,02,000
			हथके का मिक्का		18,71,54,000
			भारत सरकार की रूपया प्रति-		5715,35,51,000
			तियाँ		
			देश विनिमय बिल और दूसरे		
			वाणिज्य-पत्र		
कुल वेवसाए		6058,34,07,000	कुल आस्तियाँ		6058,34,07,000

तारीख: 17 अक्टूबर 1974

एस० जगन्नाथ, गवर्नर

91GI/74—2.

11 अक्टूबर, 1974 को रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्तियाँ	रुपये
भुक्ता पूजा	5,00,00,000	नोट	26,85,52,000
आरक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	3,92,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण		छोटा सिक्का	3,60,000
(दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि	284,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण		(क) वेशी	126,02,34,000
(स्थिरीकरण) निधि	95,00,00,000	(क) विदेशी	..
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल	704,90,06,000
(दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि	265,00,00,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ भुक्ता*	464,06,48,000
जमा राशियाँ :—		निवेश **	236,88,76,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और अधिम :—	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	84,56,37,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	..
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	8,73,43,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को @	51,05,43,000
(क) बैंक		ऋण और अधिम :—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	552,10,42,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को *	76,52,25,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	14,57,72,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को **	262,16,21,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	1,54,82,000	(iii) दूसरों को	6,55,00,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से	
		ऋण, अधिम और निवेश	
1 अन्य बैंक	1,38,89,000	(क) ऋण और अधिम :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	67,82,38,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	14,79,20,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त निगम को	63,80,00,000
(ग) अन्य	364,62,36,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश	11,16,98,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण	
		और अधिम	
देय बिल	110,27,10,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अधिम	47,66,17,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से	
अन्य देयताएं	536,50,49,000	ऋण, अधिम और निवेश	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अधिम	220,86,57,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश	..
		अन्य आस्तियाँ	92,10,73,000
	रुपये 2473,31,60,000		रुपये 2473,31,60,000

\* नकदी, प्रावधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियाँ शामिल हैं।

\*\* राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

@ राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अधिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों को दिये गये अस्थायी ओवर-ड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

\* रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17(4)(ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को मीयादी बिलों पर अधिम दिये गये 16,41,00,000/-रुपये शामिल हैं।

\*\* राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रवर्तन) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अधिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

एम० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर

[सं० फ० 10(1)/74-बी०प्रो०-1]

च०ब० सीरबन्धानो,

अवर सचिव

तारीख : 17 अक्टूबर, 1974

S O 2853 —An account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India, 1934, for the week ended the 11th day of October, 1974  
(Issue Department)

Liabilities	Rs.	Rs.	Assets	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	26,85,52,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation	6031,48,55,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,05,000	
Total Notes issued		6058,34,07,000	(b) Held outside India	..	
			Foreign Securities	141,73,97,000	
			Total		324,37,02,000
			Rupees Coin		18,71,54,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		57,15,35,51,000
			International Bills of Exchange and other Commercial paper.		.
Total Liabilities		6058,34,07,000	Total Assets		6058,34,07,000

S. JAGANNATHAN Governor

Dated the 17th day of October 1974

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 11th October, 1974

Liabilities	Rs.	Assets	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	26,85,52,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	3,92,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.	284,00,00,000	Small Coin	3,60,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	95,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.	265,00,00,000	(a) Internal	126,02,34,000
Deposits :—		(b) External	
(a) Government		(c) Government Treasury Bills	704,90,06,000
(i) Central Government	84,56,37,000	Balance Held Abroad*	464,06,48,000
(ii) State Governments	8,73,43,000	Investments**	236,88,76,000
(b) Banks		Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	552,10,42,000	(i) Central Government	
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	14,57,72,000	(ii) State Governments@	51,05,43,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,54,82,000	Loans and Advances to :—	
(iv) Other Banks	1,38,89,000	(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks x	76,52,25,000
(c) Others	364,62,36,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks x x	262,16,21,000
Bills Payable	110,27,10,000	(iii) Others	6,55,00,000
Other Liabilities	536,50,40,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) State Governments	67,82,38,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	14,79,20,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	
		(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation	63,80,00,000
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures.	11,16,98,000
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	47,66,17,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank.	220,86,57,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	.
		Other Assets	92,10,73,000
	Rupees		Rupees
	2473,31,60,000		2473,31,60,000

\*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities

\*\*Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments

x Includes Rs. 16,41,00,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

x x Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund

S JAGANNATHAN Governor

[No F. 10(1)/74 BO I]

Dated the 17th day of October 1974

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

## वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2854.—मंडूक-टांग निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1965 के नियम 8 के अनुसरण में एवं भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व विदेश व्यापार और प्रति मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 3323, तारीख 14 अगस्त 1969 को अधिकांश करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार सीधे सी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में वर्णित व्यक्तियों को, उसके स्तम्भ (1) में तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टियों में वर्णित निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण के विनियम के विरुद्ध उक्त नियमों के अधीन अपीलें की सुनवाई के प्रयोजन के लिए विशेषज्ञों के पैनल के रूप में नियुक्त करती है:

परन्तु जहाँ उक्त पैनल का कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितबद्ध है, तो वह उससे सम्बन्धित कार्य-वाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा।

## सारणी

प्राधिकरण, जिसके निर्णय के व्यक्ति जिनसे विशेषज्ञों के पैनल का जिसकी विरुद्ध अपील की जा सकेगी अपील की जा सकेगी गठन होगा

1	2
1. केरल, कर्नाटक राज्यों तथा लक्षद्वीप मिनिकोय तथा अमीन दीवी द्वीप समूह संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण-कोचीन।	1. श्री भार० माधवन नायर, कोचीन, कम्पनी (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, एनाकुलम, कोचीन अध्यक्ष 2. संयुक्त निदेशक, समुद्री-उत्पाद निर्यात विकास प्राधिकरण, कोचीन पदेन 3. निदेशक, केन्द्रीय मत्स्य प्रोद्योगिकी संस्थान, एनाकुलम, कोचीन पदेन 4. मत्स्य निदेशक, केरल सरकार, त्रिवेन्द्रम पदेन 5. प्रबन्ध निदेशक, केरल फिशरीज कारपोरेशन लि० शण्मुखम्, मार्ग, एनाकुलम, कोचीन 6. अध्यक्ष/उपाध्यक्ष/मनोनीत भारतीय समुद्र खाद्य निर्यात समम, कोचीन 7. श्री एक० बी० प्राल्लिन, मलयालम इंस्टीट्यूट एंड कमर्शियल एंटरप्राइजिज क्विलोन 8. श्री सी० जेरिनय, निदेशक, चैम्बर्स एक्सपोर्ट्स (प्रा०) लि०, कोचीन

1	2
II. महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात, राज्यों, श्रीर गोवा, वमण, दीव, दावरा तथा नगर हुवेली के संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण-मुम्बई	9. अध्यक्ष/उपाध्यक्ष, मेसूर सी-कूड केनर्स, फीजर्स एंड एक्सपोर्टर्स एसोसिएशन (रजि०) हैंग बाजार, मंगलोर गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद, कोचीन 1. संयुक्त निदेशक (निर्यात संवर्धन), आयात तथा निर्यात के संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक का कार्यालय न्यू मैरीन लाइन्स, सी०जी०प्री० बिल्डिंग, मुम्बई पदेन/अध्यक्ष 2. मत्स्य निदेशक, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, मुम्बई पदेन 3. प्रबन्ध-निदेशक महाराष्ट्र मत्स्य विकास निगम सेसून डाक, कोलाबा मुम्बई। 4. प्रशासक, महाराष्ट्र राज्य मछलीमार सहकारी [संघ लिमिटेड] मुम्बई, 5. श्री एस० बी० मणि, महा-प्रबन्धक, गुजरात फिशरीज सैन्ट्रल कोऑपरेटिव एसोसिएशन, सेसून डाक, कोलाबा, मुम्बई 6. डा० एस० बी० गोखले, मेसर्स चोगले प्रा० लिमिटेड, इंडिया हाउस, मुम्बई गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद, मुम्बई III. आन्ध्र प्रदेश, तमिलनाडु राज्यों और पांडिचेरी संघ राज्यक्षेत्र के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण-मद्रास 1. मत्स्य निदेशक, तमिलनाडु सरकार, मद्रास पदेन। अध्यक्ष श्री सी० जेरिनय, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, ईस्टर्न सी-कूड्स (प्रा०) लिमिटेड मद्रास 2. उप-निदेशक, समुद्री उत्पादन निर्यात विकास प्राधिकरण, मद्रास पदेन

1	2
	4 श्री वी० ए० कुरीयन, सदर्न सी-फूड्स (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, मद्रास।
	5 श्री एस० एम्ब्रोस फर्नांडी, अध्यक्ष, मत्स्य-निर्यात चैम्बर, तूतीकोरीन।
	6 अध्यक्ष। उपाध्यक्ष, तमिलनाडु समुद्री उत्पादन निर्यातक संघ, मद्रास।  गैर-सदस्य संयोजक उप-निदेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण प्राधिकरण, मद्रास
4. असम, बिहार, नागालैण्ड, उड़ीसा पं० बंगाल, अरुणा- चल प्रदेश, मिजोरम तथा अंडमान एवं निकोबार द्वीप-समूह राज्य/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला निर्यात निरीक्षण प्राधिकरण- कलकत्ता	डा० ए० एन० बोस, उप-कुलपति, <sup>1</sup> जादवपुर विश्व-विद्यालय, कलकत्ता पदेन* अध्यक्ष 2. मत्स्य निदेशक, उड़ीसा सरकार कटक। 3. मत्स्य निदेशक, पं० बंगाल सरकार, कलकत्ता पदेन 5. श्री० जी० आर कामावली, मै० जी० आर० कामावली, 87, लोअर सर्कुलर रोड, कलकत्ता-14 6. श्री एस० सी० मलिक, द्वारा मै० सी०-फूड लिमिटेड, मधुपतन, कटक-3 7. श्री टी० थोमस, मै० टी० थोमस एंड कं०, अन्ननालपत्तन, पुरी। 8. श्री ए० के० सेन, मै० कलकत्ता सी-फूड्स, 10, क्रुकेड लेन, कलकत्ता-700001

1	2
	8. श्री एस० आर० बनर्जी, मै० एसोसिएटेड इन्टरनेशनल कार- पोरेशन, 11, पोलोक स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1 9. श्री जी० के० नाग, मै० सदर्न कोल्ड स्टोरेज एंड इण्डस्ट्रीज 128, सप्त बिहारी एवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-1 गैर सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद, कलकत्ता।

2. पैनल का कोरम तीन का होगा।

[सं० 6(1)/74-नि०नि० तथा नि०सं०]

## MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

New Delhi, the 26th Octobr, 1974

**S.O. 2854.**—In pursuance of rule 6 of the Export of Frog Legs (Inspection) Rules 1965 and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Foreign Trade S.O. No. 3323 dated 14th August 1969 the Central Government hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below, as the panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules against the decision of the Export Inspection Agency mentioned in the corresponding entry in Column (1) thereof :

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal, he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies.	Persons constituting the panel of experts to which appeal lies.
(1)	(2)
I. Export Inspection Agency- Cochin: carrying out inspec- tion in the area covered by the States of Kerala/Karan- taka and the Union terri- tories of Laccadives, Mini- coy and Amindivi Islands.	1. Shri R. Madhavan Nair, Cochin Company (P) Limi- ted, Ernakulam, Cochin. Chairman 2. The Joint Director, Marine Products Export Develop- ment Authority, Cochin. Ex-officio 3. The Director, Central Insti- tute of Fisheries Technology, Ernakulam, Cochin. Ex-officio 4. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Kerala, Tri- vandrum. Ex-officio. 5. The Managing Director, Ker- ala Fisheries Corporation Ltd., Shanmugam Road, Ernakulam, Cochin. 6. The President/Vice-President, Nominee Seafood Exporters Association of India, Cochin.

(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
<p>II. Export Inspection Agency-Bombay : carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Goa, Daman, Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli.</p>	<p>7. Shri F. V. Albin, Malayil Industrial &amp; Commercial Enterprises, Quilon.</p> <p>8. Shri C. Cherian, Director, Chemmense Exports (P) Ltd., Cochin.</p> <p>9. The President/Vice-President, The Mysore Seafood Canners Freezers &amp; Exporters Association (Regd). Hoige-bazar, Mangalore.</p> <p><b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, Cochin.</p> <p>1. The Joint Director (Export Promotion), Office of the I.C.C.I. &amp; E, New Marine Lines, C.G.O. Buildings, Bombay.</p> <p>2. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay.</p> <p>3. The Managing Director, Maharashtra Fisheries Development Corporation, Sassoon Dock, Colaba, Bombay.</p> <p>4. The Administrator, Maharashtra Rajya Machimar Sahakari Sangha Limited, Bombay.</p> <p>5. Shri S. B. Mani, General Manager, Gujarat Fisheries Central Co-operative Association, Sassoon Dock, Colaba, Bombay.</p> <p>6. Dr. S.V. Gokhale, M/s. Chowgule Pvt. Ltd., India House, Bombay.</p> <p><b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, Bombay.</p>	<p>IV. Export Inspection Agency Calcutta: carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Assam, Bihar, Nagaland, Manipur, Tripura, Meghalaya, Orissa, West Bengal, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands</p> <p>1. Dr. A. N. Bose, Vice Chancellor, Jadavpur University, Calcutta.</p> <p>2. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Orissa, Cuttack.</p> <p>3. The Director of Fisheries, Government of West Bengal, Calcutta.</p> <p>4. Shri G. R. Kassamali, M/s, G. R. Kassamali, 87, Lower Circular Road, Calcutta-14.</p> <p>5. Shri S. C. Mullick C/o. M/s. Cifood Limited, Madhupatna, Cuttack-3.</p> <p>6. Shri T. Thomas, M/s. T. Thomas &amp; Co., Atranalapatna, Puri.</p> <p>7. Shri A. K. Sen, M/s. Calcutta Seafoods, 10, Crooked Lane, Calcutta-700001.</p> <p>8. Shri S. R. Banerjee, M/s Associated International Corporation, 11, Pollock Street, Calcutta-1.</p> <p>9. Shri D. K. Nag, M/s. Southern Cold Storage &amp; Industries, 128, Rasu Behari Avenue, Calcutta.</p> <p><b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, Calcutta.</p>	<p>Ex-officio-Chairman</p> <p>Ex-officio</p> <p>Ex-officio</p>
<p>III. Export Inspection Agency Madras : carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Andhra Pradesh, Tamilnadu and Pondicherry.</p>	<p>1. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Tamilnadu, Madras.</p> <p>2. Shri C. Cherian, Managing Director, Eastern Seafoods (P) Limited, Madras.</p> <p>3. The Dy Director, Marine Products Export Development Authority, Madras.</p> <p>4. Shri V. A. Kurien, Southern Seafoods (P) Limited, Madras.</p> <p>5. Shri S. Ambrose Fernando, President, Fish Exporters Chamber, Tuticorin.</p> <p>6. The President/Vice-President, Tamilnadu Marine Products Exporters Association, Madras.</p> <p><b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Dy. Director, Export Inspection Agency, Madras.</p>	<p>2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.</p> <p>[No. 6 (1)/74-EI&amp;EP.]</p> <p><b>का०प्रा० 2855.—मत्स्य और मत्स्य-उत्पाद निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में तथा भारत सरकार के भूत-पूर्व विदेश व्यापार और पूर्ति मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का०प्रा० 3322, तारीख 14 अगस्त, 1969 को अधिक्रान्त करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में वर्णित व्यक्तियों को उसके स्तम्भ (1) में तत्सं धी प्रवृत्तियों में वर्णित निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण के विनिश्चय के विरुद्ध उक्त नियमों के अधीन अपील की सुनवाई के प्रयोजनों के लिए विशेषज्ञों के पैनल रूप में नियुक्त करती है :</b></p> <p>परन्तु जहां उक्त पैनल का कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय-वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितबद्ध है, तो वह उस अपील से सम्बन्धित कार्यवाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा।</p> <p><b>सारणी</b></p> <p>प्राधिकरण, जिसके निर्णय के विरुद्ध अपील की जा सकेगी</p> <p>व्यक्ति जिनसे विशेषज्ञों के पैनल का जिसको अपील की जा सकेगी गठन होगा</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>1. केरल, कर्नाटक राज्यो तथा लक्ष्कादीव मिनिकोय तथा अमीन बोवी द्वीपसमूह सह</p> <p>1. श्री आर० माधवन् नायर, कोचीन कम्पनी (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, एनकुलम, कोचीन अध्यक्ष,</p>

1	2	1	2
राज्य क्षेत्र के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण-कोचीन	2. संयुक्त निदेशक, समुद्री-उत्पाद निर्यात विकास प्राधिकरण, कोचीन पदेन	4. प्रणामक, महाराष्ट्र राज्य मच्छीमार सहकारी सघ लिमिटेड, मुम्बई	
	3. निदेशक, केन्द्रीय मत्स्य प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान, एनक्रुलम, कोचीन पदेन	5. श्री एम० बी० मणि, महा-प्रबन्धक, गुजरात फिशरीज सैन्ट्रल कोऑपरेटिव एसोसिएशन, मैसूर डाक, कोलाबा, मुम्बई	
	4. मत्स्य निदेशक, केरल सरकार, त्रिवेन्द्रम पदेन	6. डा० एस० बी० गोखले, मैसूर जोगले प्रा० लिमिटेड इंडिया हाउस, मुम्बई	
	5. प्रबन्ध निदेशक, केरल फिशरीज कारपोरेशन लि० शण्मुखम्, मार्ग एनक्रुलम, कोचीन	गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्, मुम्बई	
	6. अध्यक्ष/उपाध्यक्ष/मनोनीत भारतीय समुद्रखाद्य निर्यातक संगम, कोचीन		
	7. श्री एफ० बी० आरविन्द, मलयालम इण्डस्ट्रियल एंड कर्मागियल एन्टरप्राइजिज, त्रिवेलोन	III. आन्ध्र प्रदेश, तमिलनाडु राज्यों और पांडिचेरी संघ राज्यक्षेत्र के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण मद्रास	1. मत्स्य निदेशक, तमिलनाडु सरकार, मद्रास पदेन/अध्यक्ष
	8. श्री सी० जेरियन निदेशक, जैम्पीन्स एक्सपोर्ट्स (प्रा०) लि०, कोचीन	2. श्री सी० जेरियन, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, ईस्टर्न सी-फूड्स (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, मद्रास	
	9. अध्यक्ष/उपाध्यक्ष, मैसूर सी-फूड केनर्स, फ्रीजर्स एंड एक्सपोर्टर्स एसोसिएशन (रजि०) ह्रेग बाजार, गंगसोर गैर सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्, कोचीन	3. उप-निदेशक समुद्री उत्पाद निर्यात विकास प्राधिकरण मद्रास पदेन	
II. महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात, राज्यों और गोवा, वसण, दीव, दादरा तथा नगर हवेली के संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण-मुम्बई	1. संयुक्त निदेशक (निर्यात संवर्धन) आयात तथा निर्यात के संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक का कार्यालय, न्यू मैरीन लाइन्स, सी०जी०ओ० बिल्डिंग, मुम्बई पदेन/अध्यक्ष	4. श्री बी० ए० कुरियन, सचन सी-फूड्स (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, मद्रास	
	2. मत्स्य निदेशक, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, मुम्बई पदेन	5. श्री एम० एम्ब्रोस फर्नाण्डो, अध्यक्ष, मत्स्य निर्यात जैम्बर, तूतीकोरोन ।	
	3. प्रबन्ध-निदेशक, महाराष्ट्र मत्स्य विकास निगम, मैसूर डाक, कोलाबा, मुम्बई	6. अध्यक्ष/उपाध्यक्ष तमिलनाडु समुद्री उत्पाद निर्यातक संगम, मद्रास गैर सदस्य संयोजक उप निदेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण, मद्रास	
		IV. असम, बिहार, नागालैण्ड, उड़ीसा, प० बंगाल, अरुणाचल प्रदेश, मिजोरम तथा अंडमान एवं निकोबार द्वीप समूह	1. डा० ए० एन० बोस, उप कुलपति, जादवपुर विश्वविद्यालय, कलकत्ता पदेन-अध्यक्ष

1	2	TABLE	
		Authority against whose decision appeal lies.	Persons constituting the panel of experts to which appeal lies.
(1)	(2)		
राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला नियमित निरीक्षण अधिकरण-कलकत्ता	2. मत्स्य निदेशक उड़ीसा सरकार, कटक ।	I. Export Inspection Agency-Cochin : carrying out inspection in the area covered by the States of Kerala/Karnataka and the Union territories of Laccadives, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands.	1. Shri R. Madhavan Nair, Cochin Company (P) Limited, Ernakulam, Cochin. Chairman 2. The Joint Director, Marine Products Export Development Authority, Cochin. Ex-officio 3. The Director, Central Institute of Fisheries Technology, Ernakulam, Cochin. Ex-officio 4. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Kerala, Trivandrum. Ex-officio. 5. The Managing Director, Kerala Fisheries Corporation Ltd., Shanmugam Road Ernakulam, Cochin. 6. The President/Vice-President, Nominee, Seafood Exporters Association of India, Cochin. 7. Shri F. V. Albin, Malayil Industrial & Commercial Enterprises, Quilon. 8. Shri C. Cherian, Director, Chemmeens Exports (P) Ltd., Cochin. 9. The President/Vice-President, The Mysore Seafood Canners Freezers & Exporters Association (Regd.), Hoigebazari, Mangalore.
	3. मत्स्य निदेशक, प० बंगाल सरकार, कलकत्ता पदेल		
	4. श्री जी० आर० कामामली, मै० जी० आर० कामामली, 87, सोमर सफुलर रोड, कलकत्ता-14		
	5. श्री एस० सी० मलिक, द्वारा मै० सी० फूड लिमिटेड, मधुपसन, कटक-3		
	6. श्री टी० योमस, मै० टी० योमस एंड क० प्रबन्धनालयपसन, पुरी ।		
	7. श्री ए० के० सेन, मै० कलकत्ता सी० फूड्स, 10, कुकेड सेन, कलकत्ता-700001		
	8. श्री एस० आर० बनर्जी, मै० एसोसिएटेड इन्टरनेशनल कार्पो- रेशन, 11, पोलीक स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1		
	9. श्री डी० के० नाग, मै० मदर कोल्ड स्टोरेज एंड इन्फ्रस्ट्रक्चर, 128, रासबिहारी एवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-1		
	गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक, नियमित निरीक्षण परिषद्, कलकत्ता	II. Export Inspection Agency-Bombay : carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Goa, Daman, Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli.	1. The Joint Director (Export Promotion), Office of the J.C.C.I. & E., New Marine Lines, C. G. O. Buildings, Bombay. Ex-officio-Chairman 2. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay. Ex-officio 3. The Managing Director, Maharashtra Fisheries Development Corporation, Sassoon Dock, Colaba, Bombay. 4. The Administrator, Maharashtra Rajya Machimar Sahakari Sangha Limited, Bombay. 5. Shri S. B. Mani, General Manager, Gujarat Fisheries Central Co-operative Association, Sassoon Dock, Colaba, Bombay. 6. Dr. S. V. Gokhale, M/s. Chowkule Pvt. Ltd., India House, Bombay.

2. पैनेल का कौरम तीन का होगा ।

[सं० 6(1)/74-नि०नि० तथा नि०सं०]

S.O. 2855.—In pursuance of rule 6 of the Export of Fish and Fish Products (Inspection) Rules 1964 and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Foreign Trade and Supply S.O. No. 3322 dated 14th August 1969 the Central Government hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below, as the panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules against the decision of the Export Inspection Agency mentioned in the corresponding entry in Column (1) thereof :

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal, he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.



1	2
	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, Bombay.
III. Export Inspection Agency Madras : carrying out ins- pection in the areas covered by the States/Union terri- tories of Andhra Pradesh, Tamilnadu and Pondichery	1. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Tamilnadu, Madras. Ex-officio-Chairman 2. Shri C. Cherian, Managing Director, Eastern Seafoods (P) Limited, Madras. 3. The Dy. Director, Marine Products Export Develop- ment Authority, Madras. Ex-officio 4. Shri V. A. Kurien, Southern Seafoods (P) Limited, Madras. 5. Shri S. Ambrose Fernando, President, Fish Exporters Chamber, Tuticorin. 6. The President/Vice-President, Tamilnadu Marine Products Exporter's Association, Madras.
	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Dy. Director, Export Inspection Agency, Madras.
IV. Export Inspection Agency Calcutta : carrying out ins- pection in the areas covered by the States/Union terri- tories of Assam, Bihar, Na- galand, Manipur, Tripura, Meghalaya, Orissa, West Bengal, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and the Anda- man and Nicobar Islands.	1. Dr. A. N. Bose, Vice Chan- cellor, Jadavpur University, Calcutta. Ex-officio-Chairman 2. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Orissa, Cuttack. Ex-officio 3. The Director of Fisheries, Government of West Bengal, Calcutta. Ex-officio 4. Shri G. R. Kassamali, M/s. G. R. Kassamali, 87, Lower Circular Road, Calcutta-14 5. Shri S. C. Mullick, C/o. M/s. Cifood Limited, Madhu- patna, Cuttack-3. 6. Shri T. Thomas, M/s. T. Thomas & Co., Atranala- patna, Puri. 7. Shri A. K. Sen, M/s. Cal- cutta Seafoods, 10, Crooked Lane, Calcutta-700001. 8. Shri S. R. Banerjee, M/s. Associated International Corporation, 11, Pollock Street, Calcutta-1. 9. Shri D. K. Nag, M/s. Southern Cold Storage & Industries, 128, Rash Behari Avenue, Calcutta.
	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, Calcutta.

2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.

का० प्रा० 2856.—हिमशोनिन मास्टर पुन्ड नियत (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 के नियम 8 के अनुसरण में तथा भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व विदेश व्यापार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 695, तारीख 19 फरवरी, 1972 को अधिकांश करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में वर्णित व्यक्तियों को उसके स्तम्भ (1) में तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टियों में वर्णित नियत निरीक्षण अधिकरण के विनिश्चय के विरुद्ध उक्त नियमों के अधीन अपील की सुनवाई के प्रयोजन के लिए विधेयों के पैनल के रूप में नियुक्त करती है :

परन्तु जहां उक्त पैनल का कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितबद्ध है, तो वह उससे सम्बन्धित कार्य-वाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा।

#### सारणी

प्राधिकरण, जिसके निर्णय के व्यक्ति जिनसे विधेयों के पैनल का विरुद्ध अपील की जा सकेगी जिसको अपील की जा सकेगी गठन होगा

1	2
1. केरल, कर्नाटक राज्यों तथा लक्कादीव मिनिकोय तथा अमीनदीवी द्वीप समूह संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला नियत निरीक्षण अधि- करण-कोचीन	1. श्री आर० माधवन् नायर, कोचीन कम्पनी (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, एनाकुलम, कोचीन अध्यक्ष 2. संयुक्त निदेशक, समुद्री-उत्पाद निर्यात विकास प्राधिकरण, कोचीन पदेन 3. निदेशक, केन्द्रीय मत्स्य प्रोद्योगिकी संस्थान, एनाकुलम, कोचीन पदेन 4. मत्स्य निदेशक, केरल सरकार, त्रिवेन्द्रम पदेन 5. प्रबन्ध निदेशक, केरल फिशरीज कार्पोरेशन लि०, शम्भुखम् मार्ग, एनाकुलम, कोचीन 6. अध्यक्ष/उपाध्यक्ष/मनोनीत भारतीय समुद्रशास्त्र निर्यातक संगम, कोचीन 7. श्री एफ० बी० आल्विन, मलयालम इण्डस्ट्रियल एंड कमर्शियल एण्टरप्राइजिज, क्विलोन । 8. श्री सी० वेरियन, निदेशक, चेम्मीन्स एक्सपोर्ट्स (प्रा०) लि०, कोचीन 9. अध्यक्ष/उपाध्यक्ष, सेमूर सी-फूड केनर्स, फ्रीजर्स एंड एक्सपोर्टर्स एसोसिएशन (रजि०), हैग बाजार, संगनोर गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद, कोचीन ।

1	2	1	2
II महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात, राज्यों और गोवा, दमण, दीव, दादरा तथा नगर हवेली के संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण-मुम्बई	1. संयुक्त निदेशक (निर्यात संवर्धन), आयात तथा निर्यात के संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक का कार्यालय, न्यू मैरीन लाइन्स, सी०जी०ओ० बिल्डिंग, मुम्बई पदेन/अध्यक्ष	6. अध्यक्ष/उपाध्यक्ष तमिलनाडु समुद्री उत्पाद निर्यातक संगम, मद्रास । गैर-सदस्य संयोजक उप-निदेशक निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण, मद्रास	
	2. मत्स्य निदेशक महाराष्ट्र सरकार, मुम्बई पदेन		
III. आन्ध्र प्रदेश, तमिलनाडु राज्यों और पांडिचेरी संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण-मद्रास	3. प्रबन्ध-निदेशक, महाराष्ट्र मत्स्य विकास निगम, सैसून डाक, कोलाबा, मुम्बई	4. असम बिहार, नागालैण्ड, उड़ीसा, प० बंगाल, अरुणाचल प्रदेश, मिजोरम तथा मंड्रान एवं निकोबार द्वीप समूह राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के अंतर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाला निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण-कलकत्ता	1. डा० ए० एन० बोस, उप-कुलपति जावहपुर विश्वविद्यालय, कलकत्ता पदेन/अध्यक्ष
	4. प्रशासक, महाराष्ट्र राज्य मच्छीमार सहकारी सघ लिमिटेड, मुम्बई		2. मत्स्य निदेशक उड़ीसा सरकार कटक
	5. श्री एस० बी० मणि, महा-प्रबन्धक, गुजरात कृषिरीज सैन्ट्रल कोऑपरेटिव एसोसिएशन, सैसून डाक, कोलाबा, मुम्बई		3. मत्स्य निदेशक, प० बंगाल सरकार कलकत्ता पदेन
	6. डा० एस० बी० गोखले, मै० खोगले प्रा० लिमिटेड, इंडिया हाउस, मुम्बई गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद, मुम्बई		4. श्री जी० आर० कासामली, मै० जी० आर० कासामली, 87, लोअर सर्कुलर रोड, कलकत्ता-14
			5. श्री एस० सी० मलिक, द्वारा मै० सी-फूड लिमिटेड, मधुपसन, कटक-3
			6. श्री टी० थोमस, मै० टी० थोमस एंड कं०, अन्ननासपत्तन, पुरी
			7. श्री ए० के० सेन, मै० कलकत्ता सी-फूड्स, 10-कुकुड लेन, कलकत्ता-700001
			8. श्री एस० आर० बमर्जी, मै० एसोसिएटेड इन्टरनेशनल कार्पोरेशन, 11, पोलोक स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1
			9. श्री डी० के० नाग, मै० सदर्न कोल्ड स्टोरेज एंड इन्फ्रस्ट्रक्चर, 128, रासबिहारी एवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-1
			गैर सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद, कलकत्ता
	1. मत्स्य निदेशक, तमिलनाडु सरकार, मद्रास । पदेन/अध्यक्ष		
	2. श्री सी० चेरियन, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, ईस्टर्न सी-फूड्स (प्रा०) लिमिटेड मद्रास		
	3. उप-निदेशक समुद्री उत्पाद निर्यात विकास प्राधिकरण, मद्रास पदेन		
	4. श्री बी० ए० कुरीयन, सदर्न सी-फूड्स (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, मद्रास ।		
	5. श्री एस० एम्ब्रोस फर्नान्डो, अध्यक्ष, मत्स्य-निर्यात समिति, तूतीकोरीम		
		2. पैस का कोरम तीन का होगा ।	

**S.O. 2856.**—In pursuance of rule 8 of the Export of Frozen Lobster Tails (Inspection) Rules 1971 and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Foreign Trade S.O. No. 695 dated 19th February, 1972 the Central Government hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below, as the panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules against the decision of the Export Inspection Agency mentioned in the corresponding entry in Column (1) thereof :

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal, he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies.	Persons constituting the panel of experts to which appeal lies.
1	2
I. Export Inspection Agency-Cochin : carrying out inspection in the area covered by the States of Kerala/Karnataka and the Union territories of Laccadives, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shri R. Madhavan Nair, Cochin Company (P) Limited, Ernakulam, Cochin. Chairman</li> <li>2. The Joint Director, Marine Products Export Development Authority, Cochin. Ex-officio</li> <li>3. The Director, Central Institute of Fisheries Technology, Ernakulam, Cochin. Ex-officio</li> <li>4. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Kerala, Trivandrum. Ex-officio</li> <li>5. The Managing Director, Kerala Fisheries Corporation Ltd., Shanmugam Road, Ernakulam, Cochin.</li> <li>6. The President/Vice-President, Nominee Seafood Exporters Association of India, Cochin.</li> <li>7. Shri F. V. Albin, Malayali Industrial &amp; Commercial Enterprises, Quilon.</li> <li>8. Shri C. Cherian, Director, Chemmeens Exports (P) Ltd., Cochin.</li> <li>9. The President/Vice-President, The Mysore Seafood Canners Freezers &amp; Exporters Association (Regd.), Hoigebazar, Mangalore.</li> </ol>
	<b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, Cochin.
II. Export Inspection Agency-Bombay : carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Maharashtra, Gujarat, Goa, Daman, Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Joint Director (Export Promotion), Office of the J.C.C.I. &amp; E., New Marine Lines, C. G. O. Buildings, Bombay. Ex-officio-Chairman.</li> <li>2. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay. Ex-officio</li> <li>3. The Managing Director, Maharashtra Fisheries Development Corporation, Sassoon Dock, Colaba, Bombay.</li> </ol>

1	2
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The Administrator, Maharashtra Rajya Machimar Sahakari Sangha Limited, Bombay.</li> <li>5. Shri S. B. Mani, General Manager, Gujarat Fisheries Central Co-operative Association, Sassoon Dock, Colaba, Bombay.</li> <li>6. Dr. S.V. Gokhale, M/s. Chowgule Pvt. Ltd., India House, Bombay.</li> </ol>
	<b>NON-MEMBER CONVEVER</b> The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, Bombay.
III. Export Inspection Agency Madras : carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Andhra Pradesh, Tamilnadu and Pandichery.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Tamilnadu, Madras. Ex-officio-Chairman</li> <li>2. Shri C. Cherian, Managing Director, Eastern Seafoods (P) Limited, Madras.</li> <li>3. The Dy. Director, Marine Products Export Development Authority, Madras. Ex-officio</li> <li>4. Shri V. A. Kurien, Southern Seafoods (P) Limited, Madras</li> <li>5. Shri S. Ambrose Fernando, President, Fish Exporters Chamber, Tuticorin.</li> <li>6. The President/Vice-President, Tamilnadu Marine Products Exporters' Association, Madras.</li> </ol>
	<b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Dy. Director, Export Inspection Agency, Madras.
IV. Export Inspection Agency Calcutta : carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Assam, Bihar, Nagaland, Manipur, Tripura, Meghalaya, Orissa, West Bengal, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dr. A. N. Bose, Vice Chancellor, Jadavpur University, Calcutta. Ex-officio-Chairman</li> <li>2. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Orissa, Cuttack. Ex-officio</li> <li>3. The Director of Fisheries, Government of West Bengal, Calcutta. Ex-officio</li> <li>4. Shri G. R. Kassamali, M/s. G. R. Kassamali, 87, Lower Circular Road, Calcutta-14.</li> <li>5. Shri S. C. Mullick, C/o. M/s. Cifood Limited, Madhupatna, Cuttack-3.</li> <li>6. Shri T. Thomas, M/s. T. Thomas &amp; Co., Atrana-lapatna, Puri.</li> <li>7. Shri A. K. Sen, M/s. Calcutta Seafoods, 10, Crooked Lane, Calcutta-700001.</li> <li>8. Shri S. R. Banerjee, M/s. Associated International Corporation, 11, Pollock Street, Calcutta-1.</li> <li>9. Shri D. K. Nag, M/s. Southern Cold Storage &amp; Industries, 128, Rash Behari Avenue, Calcutta.</li> </ol>
	<b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, Calcutta.

2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.

[No. 6(1)/74-EI&EP]

क्रा०प्रा० 2857.—संलग्न रिक्त अमल निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1973 के नियम 7 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एनवशारा नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को उनके स्तम्भ (1) में उल्लिखित निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरणों के निर्णय के विरुद्ध उक्त नियम के अधीन अपील की सुनवाई के प्रयोजनार्थ विशेषज्ञों के पैनल के रूप में नियुक्त करती है ;

परन्तु यह कि जहाँ उक्त किसी पैनल में कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितबद्ध है तो वह उस अपील से संबंधित कार्यवाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा।

#### सारणी

प्राधिकरण, जिसके निर्णय के विशेषज्ञों का पैनल बनाने वाले व्यक्ति विरुद्ध अपील की जा सकती है जिनको अपील होगी

1	2
निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण, कलकत्ता	1. श्री एन०सी० ठक्कर, मै० सी० डी० ठक्कर एंड क०, 22, ब्राबोर्न रोड, कलकत्ता-1 अध्यक्ष
	2. श्री पी० एन० हलदार, मै० बंगाल कैमिकल एंड फार्मास्यु- टिकल प्रवर्क लि०, पनीहाटी, 24 परगना, प० बंगाल
	3. डा० टी० गुहा, अल्कली एंड कैमिकल कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया लि०, पो०ओ० रिशरा, जिला दुगली
	4. श्री एस० के० राय, मै० यूनाइटेड एसिड एंड कैमिकल कारपोरेशन 83/2, मोतीलाल गुप्ता रोड, कलकत्ता-41
	5. निदेशक, भारतीय मानक संस्थान, 5, बौरंगी एप्रोच, कलकत्ता-13 पदेन,
	6. उप-निदेशक (कैमिकल), नेशनल टेस्ट हाउस, भारत सरकार 11/1, जजिस कोर्ट रोड, अलीपुर, कलकत्ता-27 पदेन,
	गैर-सदस्य संयोजक उप निदेशक (रसा०) निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद, 14/1-बी एजरा स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1 पदेन,
2. निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण बम्बई	1. डा० आर० सी० अमीन, थेराप्यूटिक्स कैमिकल रिसर्च कारपोरेशन 95, मैरिलेड रोड, बम्बई-8 अध्यक्ष

1	2
	2. श्री के० के० बाया, मै० एक्सल इण्डस्ट्रीज, 184/187 स्वामी विवेकानन्द रोड शोनेश्वरी, बम्बई-60
	3. डा. एम०बी० नायक, मै० गोल्डन कैमिकल्स, "टुबैको हाउस", विले पारले, बम्बई-56
	4. श्री एम० चटर्जी, श्रीफोर्मिस्ट, मै० भारत पलबराइजिंग मिल्स प्रा० लि०, 389, सयानी रोड, बम्बई-25
	5. निदेशक, भारतीय मानक संस्थान, "नाबल्टी चेम्बर्स", ग्रांट रोड, बम्बई-7 पदेन,
	6. उप-निदेशक इंचार्ज, नेशनल टेस्ट हाउस, भारत सरकार गौतम बिर्लिंग, जकारिया बन्दर रोड, सबरी, बम्बई-15 पदेन,
	गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, 113, महर्षि कर्बे रोड, बम्बई-4 पदेन,
3. निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण, दिल्ली	1. श्री टी० आर० पारिख, मै० डी०सी०एम० कैमिकल प्रवर्क, नाज बिर्लिंग, 1, झंड़ेवालान एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली, अध्यक्ष
	2. श्री सन्तोष सिंह, मै० नेशनल कैमिकल इण्डस्ट्रीज प्रा० लि०, 26 नजफगढ़ रोड, नई दिल्ली-15
	3. श्री ए० एस० प्रोवर, उत्पादन प्रबंधक, मै० रेनवेक्सी लेबोरेटरीज लि०, आखला इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, नई दिल्ली-20
	4. श्री रमेश चन्द्र खरार, जनरल मैनेजर (आर०एण्ड डी०), मै० न्यूकेम प्लास्टिक लि०, 54, इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, फरीदाबाद, हरियाणा
	5. श्री के० मणियानन, तकनीकी विशेषज्ञ, (कैमिकल अभियांत्रिक), उद्योग निदेशालय, हरियाणा, चंडीगढ़

1	2
	<p>6. उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार का श्रीद्योगिक रसायनज्ञ, पदेन एच० श्री० तकनीकी संस्थान, नवाब गंज, कानपुर।</p> <p><b>गैर-सदस्य संयोजक</b></p> <p>संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद,</p> <p>13/37, पश्चिमी विस्तार क्षेत्र,</p> <p>आर्य समाज रोड, नई दिल्ली-5.</p>
4 निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण, मद्रास।	<p>1 श्री बी० परमेश्वरन नायर, बक्स मैनेजर अध्यक्ष, मै० इंडियन रेयर अर्थस लि०, उद्योग मंडल, पो०आ० आलवयी, केरल</p> <p>2 श्री एस०एन० कार्निक्कन, रसायन अधीक्षक,</p> <p>मै० ई०आई०डी० पारवसी लि०, रानी पेट, नार्थ आरकोट,</p> <p>तमिलनाडु।</p> <p>3 श्री के० एस० रंगराज,</p> <p>मै० कोथारी (भद्रास) लि०,</p> <p>20, नागमवक्कम हाई रोड, मद्रास-34.</p> <p>4 श्री एस० आर० नागपाल,</p> <p>महाप्रबंधक निदेशक,</p> <p>मै० नागपाल अम्बडी पैट्रो-केम रिफाइनिंग लि०,</p> <p>मनाली, मद्रास-68.</p> <p>5 डा० जोगफ एम्बेवियर,</p> <p>रिसर्च आफिसर,</p> <p>सी फर्टिलाइजरस एंड केमिकल्स ट्रावन्कोर लिमिटेड,</p> <p>उद्योग मंडल, पो०आ० एलवैयी, केरल।</p> <p>6 निदेशक, पदेन,</p> <p>भारतीय मानक संस्थान,</p> <p>54, जनरल पेटर्स रोड, मद्रास-2.</p> <p><b>गैर सदस्य संयोजक</b></p> <p>उप-निदेशक, पदेन,</p> <p>निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण,</p> <p>123, माउंट रोड,</p> <p>मद्रास-6.</p> <p>उप निदेशक, पदेन,</p> <p>निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण,</p> <p>123, माउंट रोड,</p> <p>मद्रास-6.</p>

2. पैनेल का कोरम तीन का होगा।

[सं. 6(7)/74-नि०नि० तथा नि० सं०]

**S.O.2857:**—In pursuance of rule 7 of the Export of Sulphuric Acid (Inspection) Rules, 1973, the Central Government hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below as panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules, against the decision of the Export Inspection Agencies mentioned in column (1) thereof :

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal, he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies	Persons constituting the panels of experts to which appeal lies
1	2
1. Export Inspection Agency, Calcutta.	<p>1. Shri N.C. Thakkar, Chairman, M/s. C.D. Thakkar and Company, 22, Bra-bourne Road, Calcutta-1.</p> <p>2. Shri P.N. Halder, M/s. Bengal Chemicals &amp; Pharma-ceuticals Works Ltd., Pani-hati, 24-Pargans, West Ben-gal.</p> <p>3. Dr. T. Guha, The Alkali &amp; Chemical Corporation of (I) Ltd., P.O. Rishra, Dist. Hooghly.</p> <p>4. Shri S.K. Roy, United Acid and Chemical Corporation, 83/2, Motilal Gupta Road, Calcutta-41.</p> <p>5. The Director, . . . Ex-officio, Indian Standards Institution, 5, Chowringhee Approach, Calcutta-13.</p> <p>6. Deputy Director (Chem.), Ex-officio, National Test House, 11/1, Judges Court Road, Alipore, Calcutta-27.</p>
	<b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b>
	The Deputy Director, (Chem.) . . . Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, 14/1-B, Ezra Street, Calcutta-1.
2. Export Inspection Agency, Bombay.	<p>1. Dr. Raman C. Amin, . . . Chairman, Therapeutic Chemical Research Cor-poration 95, Morland Road, Bombay-8.</p> <p>2. Shri K.K. Chayya, M/S. Excel Industries, 184/187, Swami Vivekananda Road, Jogeshwari, Bombay-60.</p> <p>3. Dr. M.V. Nayak, M/S. Golden Chemicals, Tobacco House, Vile Parle, Bombay-56.</p> <p>4. Shri S. Chatterjee, Chief Chemist, Bharat Pulverising Mills Pvt. Ltd., 389, Sayani Road, Bombay-25.</p> <p>5. Director, . . . Ex-officio, Indian Standards Institution, Novelty Chambers, Grant Road, Bombay-7.</p> <p>6. Deputy Director-in-Charge, Ex-officio, National Test House, Gautam Building, Zakaria Bunder Road, Sewree, Bombay-15.</p>
	<b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b>
	The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, Aman Chambers, 113, M. Karve Road, Bombay-4.

1	2
III. Export Inspection Agency, Delhi.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shri T.R. Parcek,..... Chairman, M/s. D.C.M. Chemical Works, Naaz Building, 1, Jhandewalan Estate, New Delhi.</li> <li>2. Shri Santokh Singh, National Chemical Industries Pvt. Limited, 26, Najaf Garh Road, New Delhi-15.</li> <li>3. Shri A.S. Grover, Production Manager, Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd., Okhla Industrial Area, New Delhi-20.</li> <li>4. Shri Ramesh C. Barar, General Manager (R &amp; D), M/s. Nuchem Plastics Ltd., 54, Industrial Area, Faridabad (Haryana).</li> <li>5. Shri K. Manivannan, Technical Expert (Chem. Engg.), Directorate of Industries, Haryana, Chandigarh.</li> <li>6. Industrial Chemist to Govt. of U.P., .... Ex-officio, H.B. Technological Institute, Nawab Ganj, Kanpur.</li> </ol>
	<p><b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, 13/37, Western Extension Area, Arya Samaj Road, New Delhi-5.</p>
IV. Export Inspection Agency, Madras.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shri B. Parameswaran Nair, Chairman, Works Manager, M/s. Indian Rare Earths Ltd., Udyogamandal, P.O. Alwaye, Kerala.</li> <li>2. Shri S.N. Karthikeyan, Chemical Supdt., M/s. E.I.D. Parry Ltd., Ranipet, North Arcot, Tamil Nadu.</li> <li>3. Shri K.S. Rangraj, M/s. Kothari (Madras) Ltd., 20, Nungambakkam High Road, Madras-34.</li> <li>4. Shri S.R. Nagapal General Manager, M/s. Nagpal Ambadi Petro-chem. Refining Limited, Manali, Madras-68.</li> <li>5. Dr. Joseph Xavier, Research Officer, The Fertilisers and Chemicals Travancore Limited, Udyogamandal, P.O. Alwaye, Kerala.</li> <li>6. The Director,..... - Ex-officio, Indian Standards Institution, 54, General Patters Road, Madras-2.</li> </ol> <p><b>NON MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Deputy Director, Export Inspection Agency, 123, Mount Road, Madras-6.</p>

2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.

[No. 6(7)/74-EI&EP.]

का० आ० 2858 —प्रकार्बनिक वर्णक निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 के नियम 8 के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व विदेश व्यापार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० ना० आ० 4033, तारीख 27 नवम्बर, 1970 को अधिस्तुत करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को उसके स्तम्भ (1) में दी गई उससे तत्समान प्रवृत्तियों में उल्लिखित क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरणों के निर्णय के विरुद्ध उक्त नियम के अधीन अपील की सुनवाई के प्रयोजनार्थ विशेषज्ञों के पैनल के रूप नियुक्त करती है :

परन्तु यह कि जहाँ उक्त किसी पैनल में कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितवद्ध है तो वह उस अपील से संबंधित कार्यवाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा।

#### सारणी

प्राधिकरण, जिसके निर्णय के विरुद्ध विशेषज्ञों का पैनल बनाने वाले अपील की जा सके

व्यक्ति जिनको अपील होगी

1	2
I. असम, बिहार, मणिपुर, मेघालय, नागालैंड, उड़ीसा, त्रिपुरा, पश्चिम बंगाल, अरुणाचल प्रदेश, मिजोरम तथा अजमान एव निकोबार टापुओं के राज्य/केन्द्रीय प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण ।	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. श्री ए० एन० खन्ना, मै० मैकफेअरलेन पैटर्स, 18, राधा-नाथ चौधरी रोड, कलकत्ता-15, अध्यक्ष ।</li> <li>2. श्री एम० एन० राय, मै० ब्रिटिश पैटर्स (भारत) लि०, 32, चोरंगी रोड, कलकत्ता-16.</li> <li>3. डा० पी० के० पंडारी, मै० शालीमार पैटर्स लि० पो० आ० बोटैनिक गार्डन, हावड़ा ।</li> <li>4. श्री ए० के० कजारिया, मै० पिंगमेट एंड कैमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, 32, अरमेनियन स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1.</li> <li>5. प्रो० एन० के० शोस, अनु-प्रायोगिक रसायन के प्रोफेसर, विज्ञान और टेक्नोलोजी का विश्वविद्यालय कालिज, 92, आचार्य प्रफुल्लचन्द्र रोड, कलकत्ता 9.</li> <li>6. उप-निदेशक (रसा०), पदेन, नेशनल टैस्ट हाऊस, भारत सरकार, 11/1, जजिय कोर्ट रोड, अलीपुर, कलकत्ता-27. <b>नर सदस्य संयोजक</b> उप-निदेशक (रसा०), पदेन, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद, 14/1-बी, एजरा स्ट्रीट (7वीं मंजिल), कलकत्ता-1.</li> </ol>
2. गुजरात, महाराष्ट्र, दावरा तथा नगर हवेली, गोआ, दमन और दीव के राज्य/केन्द्रीय प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण :	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. प्रो० एस० पी० पोटनिस, रसायन टेक्नोलोजी विभाग, बम्बई विश्वविद्यालय, बम्बई-9, अध्यक्ष ।</li> </ol>

1	2	1	2
	<p>2. श्री बी० बी० दलाल, मै० मर्करी पेंटस एंड वारनिशस लि०; अग्रगर बाजार, कार्यालय, बी० एस० मार्ग, बम्बई-28.</p> <p>3. श्री सी० जे० भूमकर, तकनीकी प्रबंधक, मै० एशियन पेट्स (प्रा०) लि०, लाल बहादुर शास्त्री मार्ग, भन्डूपा, बम्बई-78.</p> <p>4. डा० आर० जे० राठी, मै० मुद्रणन कैमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, 162, वेलेजली रोड, समग त्रिज, पूना-1.</p> <p>5. श्री डी० डी० बाय, तकनीकी, प्रबंधक, मै० सिगमापेट्स लि०, मौगरा, ग्रन्धेरी ईस्ट, बम्बई-69.</p> <p>6. संचालक उप-निदेशक, पदेन, नेशनल टैस्ट हाउस, भारत सरकार, जकारिया बस्तर रोड, सेवरी, बम्बई-15</p>		<p><b>गैर-सदस्य संयोजक</b></p> <p>संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन, नियति निरीक्षण परिषद क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, 13/37, प० वि० क्षेत्र भार्यमसाज रोड, बंगोल बाग, नई दिल्ली-5</p>
	<p><b>गैर-सदस्य संयोजक</b></p> <p>संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन, नियति निरीक्षण परिषद, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, अमन बैम्बसे, 113, महर्षि कर्वे रोड, (बीबी मंजिल), बम्बई-4.</p>	<p>IV आन्ध्र प्रदेश, केरल, कर्नाटक, तमिलनाडु, पांडिचेरी तथा लक्का-द्वीप, मिनिकोय तथा अमीनद्वीप द्वीपों के राज्य/केंद्रीय प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण ।</p>	<p>1. प्रो० पी० बी० जनार्दन, ए० सी० कांमेश क्षेत्र, मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय, मद्रास-25, अध्यक्ष ।</p> <p>2. श्री टी० के० एस० मणी, उपमहाप्रबंधक, मै० एडीशन्स पेट्स एंड कैमिकलस लि०, प० बाक्स नं० 851, सम्बीअम, मद्रास-11.</p> <p>3. श्री बी० राममूर्ति, चीफ प्रोजेक्ट मैनेजर, मै० ट्राबनकोर टिटेनियम प्रोडक्ट्स लि०, कूचुवेली, पोस्ट बाक्स सं० 1, त्रिवेन्द्रम 21, केरल ।</p> <p>4. श्री एन० टी० आर्यगर, तकनीकी सलाहकार, मै० अस्ट्रा-मेरीन एंड पिगमेंट्स लि०, अम्बेतुर, मद्रास-53.</p> <p>5. श्री जी० कृष्णामूर्ति, तकनीकी कन्सल्टेंट एंड मैनेजर, मै० बी० को० कैमिकल कोरपोरेशन, 89 रेज, गोवर स्ट्रीट, कोयम्बूतर-1.</p> <p>6. उप-निदेशक (रसा०) पदेन, लघु उद्योग सेवा संस्थान, 65-1, जी० एस० टी० रोड, मद्रास-32.</p>
<p>III. हरियाणा, जम्मू तथा कश्मीर, मध्य प्रदेश, पंजाब, राजस्थान, उत्तर प्रदेश, देहली, चंडीगढ़ तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश, के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण ।</p>	<p>1. डा० आर० के० पूसू, मै० नागरण पेट्स (प्रा०) लि०, 46, फजल गज, कामपुर, अध्यक्ष ।</p> <p>2. श्री एन० माध, प्रबंध निदेशक, मै० केमी जेम इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, 15/291-बी, मिडिल लाहस कामपुर ।</p> <p>3. श्री बी० डी० त्यागी, बक्स मैनेजर, मै० सीवी पेट्स एंड वारनिश बक्स, मोशी नगर (उ० प्र०) ।</p> <p>4. श्री गुलाब चंद, मै० तनवर राजपूत एंड कं०, इंडस्ट्रीयल एरिया, कोटा-7 (राजस्थान) ।</p> <p>5. श्री आर० टी० यैम्पी, निदेशक, श्री राम इन्स्टीच्यूट फार इंडस्ट्रीयल रिमर्स, 19, यूनीवर्सिटी रोड, देहली-7 ।</p> <p>6. विकास अधिकारी (पेंट), पदेन तकनीकी विकास के महा-निदेशक का कार्यालय, भारत सरकार, उद्योग भवन, नई दिल्ली-11.</p>	<p>2. पैनल का कोरम तीन का होगा ।</p> <p>[सं० 8(7)/74 नि० नि० तथा नि० सं०]</p>	<p><b>गैर-सदस्य संयोजक</b></p> <p>उप-निदेशक, पदेन नियति निरीक्षण परिषद, मद्रास 123, माऊंट रोड, मद्रास-6.</p>

**S.O. 2858.**—In pursuance of rule 8 of the Export of Inorganic Pigments (Inspection) Rules, 1966, the Central Government in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry Foreign Trade No S.O. 4033 dated the 27th November, 1970, hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below as the panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules, against the decision of the Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas mentioned in the corresponding entry in column (1) thereof :

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies	Persons constituting the panel of experts to which appeal lies	1	2
I. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/ Union territories of Assam, Bihar, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Orissa, Tripura, West Bengal, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and the Andamans and Nicobar Islands.	1. Shri A.S. Khanna M/s. Macfarlane Paints, 18, Radhanath Chowdhury Road, Calcutta-15. . . . Chairman. 2. Shri M. N. Rao, M/s. British Paints (India) Ltd., 32, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-16. 3. Dr. P. K. Bhandari, M/s. Shalimar Paints Ltd., P.O. Botanic Garden, Howrah. 4. Shri A. K. Kajaria, M/s. Pigments and Chemical Industries (Pvt.) Ltd., 32, Armenian Street, Calcutta-1. 5. Prof. N.K. Bose, Professor of Applied Chemistry, University College of Science & Technology, 92, Acharyya Prafulla Chandra Road, Calcutta-9. 6. The Dy. Director (Chem.) Ex-officio National Test House, Government of India 11/1, Judge's Court Road, Alipore, Calcutta-27.	Delhi, Chandigarh and Himachal Pradesh.	3. Shri B. D. Tyagi, Works Manager, M/s. Modi Paint & Varnish Works, Modinagar (U.P.). 4. Shri Gulab Chand, M/s. Tanwar Rajput & Co., Industrial Area, Kota-7 (Rajasthan). 5. Shri R. T. Thampy, Director, Shri Ram Institute for Industrial Research, 19, University Road, Delhi-7. 6. The Development Officer (Paints), Ex-officio Office of the Director general of Technical Development, Government of India, Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi-11.
II. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/ Union territories of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Goa, Daman & Diu.	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Deputy Director (Chem.) Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, 14/1B, Ezra Street (7th floor), Calcutta-1. 1. Prof. S.P. Potnis, Department of Chemical Technology, University of Bombay, Bombay-9. . . . Chairman. 2. Shri B.V. Dalal, M/s. Mercury Paints & Varnishes Ltd., Agar Bazar, Off: V.S. Marg Bombay-28. 3. Shri C.J. Bhumkar, Technical Manager, M/s. Asian Paints (I) Ltd., Lal Bahadur Shastri Marg, Bhandup, Bombay-78. 4. Dr. R.J. Rath, M/s. Sudarshan Chemical Industries (Pvt.) Ltd., 162, Wellesley Road, Sangam Bridge, Poona-1. 5. Shri D.D. Wagh, Technical Manager, M/s. Sigma Paints Ltd., Mogra, Andheri East, Bombay-69. 6. The Dy. Director-in-Charge, Ex-officio National Test House, Government of India, Zakaria Bunder Road, Sewree, Bombay-15.	IV. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/ Union territories of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Pondichery and the Laccadivi, Minicoy & Amindivi Islands.	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Joint Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, Regional Office, 13/37, W.E.A. Arya Samaj Road, Karolbagh, New Delhi-5. 1. Prof. P.B. Janardhan, A.C. College Campus, Madras University Madras-25. . . . Chairman. 2. Sri T.K.S. Mani, Dy. General manager, M/s. Additions Paints & Chemicals Ltd., Post Box No. 851, Sembiam, Madras-11. 3. Shri B. Rama Murti, Chief Project Manager, M/s. Travancore Titanium Products Ltd., Kochuvelli, Post Box 1, Trivandrum-21, Kerala. 4. Shri N.T. Iyengar, Technical Adviser, M/s. Ultramarine & Pigments Ltd., Ambattur, Madras-53. 5. Shri G. Krishnamurthy, Technical Consultant & Works Manager, M/s. Veeco Chemical Corporation, 89, Range Gowder Street, Coimbatore-1. 6. The Dy. Director (Chem.), Ex-officio, Small Industries Service, Institute, 65/1, G.S.T. Road, Madras-32.
III. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/ Union territories of Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh,	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Joint Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, Regional Office, Aman Chambers, 113, M. Karve Road (4th floor), Bombay-4. 1. Dr. R. K. Sud, M/s. Nagrath Paints (Pvt.) Ltd., 46, Fazal Ganj, Kanpur. Chairman. 2. Shri N. Nath, Managing Director, M/s. Chemichrome Industries (P) Ltd., 15/291-B, Civil Lines, Kanpur.	2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Deputy Director, Ex-officio, Export Inspection Agency-Madras, 123, Mount Road, Madras-6.

[No. 6(7)/74-EI&amp;EP]

क्रा० प्र० 2859.—क्रोम वर्णक निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 7 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई सारणी स्तंभ (2) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को उसके स्तंभ (1) में उल्लिखित निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरणों के निर्णय के विरुद्ध उक्त नियम के अधीन अपीलों की सुनवाई के प्रयोजनार्थ विशेषज्ञों के पैनल के रूप में नियुक्त करती है :

परन्तु यह कि जहाँ उक्त किसी पैनल में कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितबद्ध है तो वह उस अपील से संबंधित कार्यवाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा ।



सारणी	1	2
प्राधिकरण, जिसके निर्णय के विषय विशेषज्ञों का पैनल बनाने वाले प्रपील की जा सकती है।	विशेषज्ञों का पैनल बनाने वाले व्यक्ति जिनको प्रपील होगी।	6. प्रभारी उप-निदेशक पब्लिक नेशनल टैस्ट हाऊस जकारिया बन्दर रोड, जेबरी, बम्बई-16
1	2	
1. निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण कलकत्ता।	1. श्री ए० एम० खन्ना, अध्यक्ष मालफरलेन पेंट्स 18, राधा-नाथ चौधरी रोड, कनकता-15 2. श्री एम० एन० राव, ब्रिटिश पेंट्स (भारत) लि० 32, चौरंगी रोड, कलकत्ता-16 3. डा० पी० के० भण्डारी, शालीमार पेंट्स लि०, पी०आ० नोटोनिक गाईन, बृजवाड़ा 4. श्री ए० के० कजूरिया, पिस-सेंट एड कैमिकल इण्डस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि० 32, ग्रामेनियम स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1 5. प्रो० एम० के० बोस, प्रायोगिक रसायन के प्रोफेसर, विज्ञान और टेक्नालोजी विश्व विद्यालय कालिज, 92, आचार्य प्रफुल्ल चन्द्र रोड, कलकत्ता-9 6. उप-निदेशक (रसा०) पब्लिक नेशनल टैस्ट हाऊस, 11/1, जजिस कोर्ट रोड, झलीपुर, कलकत्ता-27 गैर-सदस्य संयोजक उप-निदेशक (रसा०) पब्लिक निरीक्षण परिषद 14/1-बी एजरा स्ट्रीट (7वीं मंजिल) कलकत्ता-1	गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक, पब्लिक निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद भ्रमन चौम्बर्स, 113, महर्षि कर्वे रोड, बम्बई-4
2. निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण, बम्बई	1. प्रो० एम० पी० पोटनिस अध्यक्ष रसायन टेक्नालोजी विभाग बम्बई विश्वविद्यालय, बम्बई-9 2. श्री आर० के० मारफतिया, तकनीकी निदेशक, गुडलास तैरेलिक पेंट्स लि० गनपतगव कदम मार्ग, लोयल परेल, बम्बई-13 3. श्री सी० जे० भूमकर, तकनीकी प्रबंधक, एशियन पेंट्स (भारत) लि० लालबहादुर शास्त्री मार्ग, बान्द्रा, बम्बई-78 4. डा० आर० जे० राठी, सुदर्शन कैमिकल इण्डस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, 162, वेलेजली रोड, संगम पुल, पूना-1 5. श्री डी० डी० वाघ, तकनीकी प्रबंधक, सी० सिगमा पेंट्स लि०, मोरगा अन्धेरी ईस्ट, बम्बई-69	3. निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण, दिल्ली। 1. डा० आर० के० सूय अध्यक्ष नागरिक पेंट (प्रा०) लि० 46, फजले गंज, कानपुर 2. श्री एन० नाथ, प्रबंध निदेशक कैमी क्रोम इण्डस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, 15/291-बी मिमिल लाइन्स, कानपुर 3. श्री बी० डी० रयागी, वर्क्स प्रबंध मोदी पेंट्स एड वारनिश वर्क्स, सीरी नगर, उ०प्र० 4. श्री गुलाब चन्द, मै० टनवर राज पुर एण्ड कं०, औद्योगिक जेल, कोटा-7 (राजस्थान) 5. डा० आर० टी० मेस्वी, निदेशक, औद्योगिक अनुसंधान का श्रीराम संस्थान, 19, यूनी-वर्सिटी रोड, दिल्ली-7 6. विकास अधिकारी पब्लिक (पेंट्स), तकनीकी विकास के सहा-निदेशक का कार्यालय, उद्योग भवन, नई दिल्ली-1
		गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निदेशक पब्लिक निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद 13/37, पश्चिमी बि० क्षेत्र, आर्य समाज रोड, नई दिल्ली-5
	4. निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण, मद्रास और कोच्चि।	1. डा० डी० वेंकटेश्वरम् अध्यक्ष रसायन अभियांत्रिक, शिक्षा विकास केन्द्र भारतीय तकनीकी संस्थान मद्रास-36। 2. श्री टी० के० एस० मणि, उप-सामान्य प्रबंधक एडिसन पेंट्स एड कैमिकल लि०, पोस्ट बाकस सं० 851 सोम्वियम मद्रास-11

1	2	3
		3. श्री बी० रामामूर्ति, चीफ प्रोजेक्ट मैनेजर, ट्रायनकोर टिटानियम प्रोजेक्टस लि०, कोच्चुवेली पोस्ट बाक्स-1 त्रिवेन्द्रम-21, केरल
		4. श्री एन टी० आर्यंगर, तकनीक सहायकार, प्रलद्दामेरीन एंड विगमेण्टस लि०, कोयम्बतूर, मद्रास-53
		5. श्री जी० कृष्णामूर्ति, टेक्नीकल कैनसल्टेंट एंड वर्क्स मैनेजर, मै० बी० टी० कौमीकल कारपोरेशन 89 मै० रंज गोवर स्ट्रीट, कोयम्बतूर-1
		6. श्री एस० जी० रामनन, उत्पादन प्रबंधक, मै० कौमेटस एंड पिग्मेंट्स लि०, नवाबपुलम, मद्रास-16
		गैर - सदस्य संयोजक
		संयुक्त निवेशक पदेन निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद महात्मा गांधी रोड, एनकुलम, कोचीन-11

## 2. पैल का कोरम तीन का होगा।

[सं० 6(7)/74-नि०लि० तथा लि० सं०]

S. O. 2859.—In pursuance of rule 7 of the Export of Chrome Pigments (Inspection) Rules, 1974 the Central Government, hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below as the panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules, against the decision of the Export Inspection Agencies mentioned in column (1) thereof:

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies	Persons constituting the panel of experts to which appeal lies.
1	2
I. Export Inspection Agency Calcutta.	1. Shri A. S. Khanna .... Chairman Macfarlane Paints, 18, Radhanath Chowdhury Road, Calcutta-15.
	2. Shri M. N. Rao, British Paints (I) Ltd., 32, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-16.
	3. Dr. P. K. Bhandari, Shallmar Paints Ltd., P.O. Botanic Garden, Howrah.
	4. Shri A. K. Kajaria, Pigments and Chemical Industries (Pvt.) Limited, 32, Armenian Street, Calcutta-1.
	5. Prof. N. K. Bose, Professor of Applied Chemistry, University College of Science and Technology, 92, Acharyya Prafulla Chandra Road, Calcutta-9.

(1)	(2)
	6. Dy. Director (Chem).... Ex-officio, National Test House, 11/1, Judge's Court Road, Alipore Calcutta-27
	Non-Member Convener
	The Deputy Director (Chem)... Ex-officio Export Inspection Council 14/1-B, Ezra Street (7th floor), Calcutta-1.
II. Export Inspection Agency, Bombay	1. Prof. S. P. Potnis,..... Chairman, Department of Chemical Technology, University of Bombay, Bombay-9.
	2. Shri R. K. Marphatia, Technical Director, Goodlass Nerolac Paints Ltd., Ganpat-rao Kadam Marg, Lower Parel Bombay-13.
	3. Shri C. J. Bhumkar, Tech. Manager, Asian Paints (I) Ltd., Lal Bahadur Shastri Marg, Bhandup, Bombay-78.
	4. Dr. R. J. Rathi, Sudarshan Chemical Industries (Pvt) Ltd., 162, Wellesley Road, Sangam Bridge, Poona-1.
	5. Shri D. D. Wagh, Technical Manager, M/s. Sigma Paints Ltd., Mogra, Andheri East, Bombay-69.
	6. Dy. Director-in-Charge... Ex-officio National Test House, Zakaria Bunder Road, Sewree, Bombay-15.
	Non-Member Convener
	The Joint Director..... Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, Aman Chambers, 113, M. Karve Road, Bombay-4.
III. Export Inspection Agency, Delhi.	1. Dr. R. K. Sud,..... Chairman, Nagrath Paints (Pvt.) Ltd. 46, Fazal Ganj, Kanpur.
	2. Shri N. Nath Mg. Director, Chemichrome Industries (Pvt.) Ltd., 15/291-B, Civil Lines, Kanpur.
	3. Shri B. D. Tyagi, Works Manager, M/s. Modi Paints and Varnish Works, Modi Nagar, U.P.
	4. Shri Gulab Chand M/s. Tanwar Rajpur and Co., Industrial Area, Kota-7. (Rajasthan).
	5. Dr. R. T. Thampy, Director, Shri Ram Institute for Industrial Research, 19, University Road, Delhi-7.
	6. The Development Officer.. Ex-officio (Paints), Office of the Director General of Technical Development Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi-1.
	Non-Member Convener
	The Joint Director.. Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, 13/37, Western Extension Area, Arya Samaj Road, New Delhi-5.

1	2	1	2
IV. Export Inspection Agencies, Madras and Cochin.	<p>1. Dr. D. Venkateswarlu, Chairman Chemical Engineering, Education Development Centre, Indian Institute of Technology, Madras-36.</p> <p>2. Shri T. K. S. Mani, Deputy General Manager, Additions Paints and Chemicals Ltd., Post Box No. 851, Sembiam Madras-11.</p> <p>3. Shri B. Rama Murti, Chief Project Manager, Travancore Titanium Products Ltd., Kochuvelli, Post Box-1, Trivandrum-21, Kerala.</p> <p>4. Shri N. T. Iyengar, Technical Adviser, Ultramarine and Pigments Ltd., Ambattur Madras-53.</p> <p>5. Shri G. Krishnamurthy, Tech. Consultant and Works Manager, M/s. Veeco Chemical Corporation, 89, Range Gowder Street, Coimbaro-1.</p> <p>6. Shri M. G. Ramanan, Production Manager, M/s. Chromates and Pigments Ltd., Nandambakkam, Madras-16.</p> <p>Non-Member Convener The Joint Director, Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Ernaklam, Cochin-11.</p>	<p>2. श्री सी० के० सोमानी, मै० हिन्दुस्तान ग्लास ग्लास मैनु- फैक्चरिंग कं० लि०, 2, बेलजली प्लेस, कलकत्ता-1</p> <p>3. श्री एम० एल० सुनसुनबासा, बंगाल ग्लास मैनुफैक्चरर्स एसोसिएशन, पी-11, मिशनरी एक्सटेंशन, कलकत्ता-1</p> <p>4. श्री के० धार० नरसिंह, मैटल बाक्स कं० प्राफ इंडिया लि०, 92/1, घलीपुर रोड, कलकत्ता- 27</p> <p>5. श्री पी० के० चटर्जी, तकनीकी प्रबंधक, मै० इलेक्ट्रिक लेप मैनुफैक्चरर्स (भारत) (प्रा०) लि०, 1, ताराटोला रोड, गाईन रोड, कलकत्ता- 24</p> <p>6. श्री एन० सी० गुप्ता, मै० बिनडो ग्लास लि०, पी० ओ० एडकीनगर, जिला हुगली (पं० बं०)</p>	

## 2. Quorum of the panel shall be three.

[No. 6(7)/74-EI&amp;EP]

का० प्रा० 2860 — वैक्यूम फ्लास्क निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1968 के नियम 7 के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व विदेश व्यापार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 783, ता० 28 जनवरी, 1971, को अधिकांश करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को उसके स्तम्भ (1) में उल्लिखित निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकारियों के निर्णय के विरुद्ध उक्त नियम के अधीन अपील की सुनवाई के प्रयोजनार्थ विशेषज्ञों के पैनल के रूप में नियुक्त करती है :

परन्तु यह कि जहां उक्त किसी पैनल में कोई सदस्य किसी अंग्रेज की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितवद्ध है तो वह उस अंग्रेज में संबंधित कार्यवाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा।

## सारणी

प्राधिकरण, जिसके निर्णय के विशेषज्ञों का पैनल बनाने वाले व्यक्ति जिनको विरुद्ध अपील की जा सकती है। अपील होगी।

1	2
1. निर्यात निरीक्षण, प्राधिकरण कलकत्ता	1. डा० एम० एन० प्रसाद, अध्यक्ष सैट्रल ग्लास और सिरेमिक रिसर्च संस्थान, जाबधपुर, कलकत्ता-32

## गैर-सदस्य संयोजक

उप-निदेशक (रसा०) पब्लेन, निर्यात  
निरीक्षण परिषद् 14/1 बी, एजरा  
स्ट्रीट (7वीं मंजिल), कलकत्ता-1

2. निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण,  
बम्बई

1. श्री आई० एच० पदमसी,  
मै० ईगल वैक्यूम बाटल मैनुफैक्चरिंग  
कं० (प्रा०) लि०, 144/46, सैरिफ,  
वेबनी स्ट्रीट, भुवला, बम्बई-3

2. श्री एम० पी० सुब,  
मै० टेक कोन एसोसिएट्स, 432,  
नाईगम फास रोड, बम्बई-31  
(डी० डी०)

3. श्री बी० धार० सिन्हे,  
मै० विकटरी फ्लास्क कं० (प्रा०)  
लि०, कचवादी, गोवांवी, बम्बई-88

4. सैवतनिक सचिव,  
ग्राल इंडिया ग्लास मर्चेण्ट्स एसोसिएशन,  
118, आइडुल रहमान स्ट्रीट, बम्बई-3

1	2
	5. उप-निवेशक, पब्लि, नेशनल टैस्ट हाउस, भारत सरकार गोतम बिल्डिंग, जकारिया, बो०डी० घार० रोड, बम्बई-15
	6. श्री के० एन० पारीख, मै० वजीर ग्लास वर्क्स लि०, जे० बी० नगर, ग्रन्थरी, बम्बई-59
	गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निवेशक, पब्लि, नियमित निरीक्षण परिक्षण क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय भवन चैम्बर्स, 113, मर्हि कर्वे रोड, (चौथी मंजिल) बम्बई-4
3. निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण, दिल्ली	1. श्री प्रार० सहाय, अध्यक्ष मै० हिन्दुस्तान वैक्यूम ग्लास लि०, फरीदाबाद, एन० घाई० टी० (हरियाणा)
	2. श्री बी० एन० भास्कर, म० ईश्वर इन्डस्ट्रीज, ईश्वर नगर, नई दिल्ली।
	3. उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार के कांभ तकनीकज्ञ, पब्लि, एच० बी० टेक्नालाजी संस्थान कानपुर (उ० प्र०)
	4. श्री एस० चटर्जी, मै० पोयशा इंडस्ट्रियल कं० लि०, नेहरू हाउस, 4, बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-1
	5. श्री हरिवल्लभ, मै० गंगा ग्लास वर्क्स लि०, बालाबली, जिला बिजनौर, (उ० प्र०)
	6. विकास घाफिसर (ग्लास) पब्लि, तकनीकी विकास के महा निवेशक का कार्यालय भारत सरकार, उद्योग भवन, नई दिल्ली-11
	गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निवेशक, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, 13/37, पं० विस्तार क्षेत्र, धार्य समाज रोड, नई दिल्ली-5
4. निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण, मद्रास-कोचीन	1. श्री एस० पी० जमाल, अध्यक्ष मै० निमदा ग्लास फैक्टरी लि०, 55-58, कोनूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-3

1	2
	2. श्री एन० घाई० पटेल, मै० के० एन० पटेल एंड कं०, 7/22, ब्राह्मवे, मद्रास-1
	3. श्री के० बी० कुरुप, प्रबंधक, मै० मद्रास शीट ग्लास वर्क्स (प्रा०) लि०, निरवलीयर, मद्रास-19
	4. प्रो० पी० बी० जनार्दन, टेक्नोलोजी का ए० सी० कालिज, मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय, गिरडी, मद्रास-25
	5. शाखा प्रबंधक, पब्लि, भारत राज्य व्यापार निगम लि०, 123, मार्जेंट रोड, मद्रास-1
	6. उप-निवेशक (निर्यात संवर्धन) पब्लि नियमित और आयात के संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक का कार्यालय, पो० घा० ब्राम्म सं० 1482 मद्रास-1
	गैर-सदस्य संयोजक संयुक्त निवेशक, पब्लि, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, महात्मा गांधी, रोड, एनकुलम, कोचीन-11
	2. पैनल का कोरम तीन का होगा।
	[सं० 6(7)/74-नि० नि० तथा नि० सं०]

**S.O.2860.**—In pursuance of rule 7 of the Export of Vacuum Flasks (Inspection) Rules, 1968, the Central Government in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Foreign Trade No. S.O. 783 dated the 28th January, 1971, hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below as the panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules, against the decision of the Export Inspection Agencies, mentioned in column (1) thereof:

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies	Persons constituting the panel of experts to which appeal lies
1	2
I. Export Inspection Agency, Calcutta	1. Dr. S.N. Prasad, Chairman. Central Glass and Cera- mics Research Institute, Jadavpur, Calcutta-32.
	2. Shri C. K. Somany, M/s. Hindusthan National Glass Manufacturing Co. Ltd., 2, Wellesley Place, Calcutta-1.

(1)	(2)
	(3) Shri M. L. Jhunjhunwale, Bengal Glass Manufacturers Association, P-11, Mission Row Extn., Calcutta-1.
	(4) Shri K. R. Narasimhan, The Metal Box Company of India Ltd., 92/1, Ali-pore Road, Calcutta-27.
	(5) Shri P. K. Chatterjee, Technical Manager, M/s. Electric Lamp Manufacturers (I) Pvt. Ltd., 1, Taratolla Road, Garden Reach, Calcutta-24.
	(6) Shri N. C. Gupta, M/s. Window Glass Ltd., P.O. Adconagar, Dist. Hooghly (W.B.).
	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Deputy Director (Chem), Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, 14/1B, Ezra Street (7th floor), Calcutta-1.

II. Export Inspection Agency, Bombay

- (1) Shri I. H. Padamsee, M/s. Eagle Vacuum Bottle Manufacturing Co. (P) Ltd., 144/46, Sheriff Devji Street, Chukla, Bombay-3. —Chairman.
- (2) Shri S. P. Sood, M/s. Tech-Con. Associates, 432, Naigaum Cross Road, Bombay-31 (DD).
- (3) Shri V. R. Bhide, M/s. Victory Flask Co. (P) Ltd., Kachwadi, Govandi, Bombay-88.
- (4) The Hony. Secretary, All India Glass Merchants Association, 116, Abdul Rehman Street, Bombay-3.
- (5) The Deputy Director, Ex-officio, National Test House, Government of India, Gautam Bldg., Zakaria BDR Road, Bombay-15.
- (6) Shri K. N. Parikh, M/s. Vazir Glass Works Ltd., J. B. Nagar, Andheri, Bombay-59.

NON-MEMBER CONVENER  
The Joint Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, Regional office, Aman Chambers, 113, M. Karve Road (4th floor), Bombay-4.

III. Export Inspection Agency, Delhi

- (1) Shri R. Sahai, M/s. Hindustan Vacuum Glass Ltd., Faridabad, N.I.T. (Haryana). —Chairman.
- (2) Shri B. N. Bhaskar, M/s. Ishwar Industries, Ishwar Nagar, New Delhi.
- (3) The Glass Technologist to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, Ex-officio, H. B. Technological Institute, Kanpur (UP).

(1)	(2)
	(4) Shri S. Chatterjee, M/s. Poysha Industrial Company Ltd., Nehru House, 4, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-1.
	(5) Shri Hari Dutt, M/s. Ganga Glass Works Ltd., Balawali, Distt. Bijnoor (UP).
	(6) The Development Officer (Glass), Ex-officio Office of the Director General of Technical Development, Government of India, Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi-11.
	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Joint Director, Export Inspection Council, Regional office, 13/37, W.E.A. Arya Samaj Road, New Delhi-5.

IV. Export Inspection Agency-Madras/Cochin

- (1) Shri S. P. Jamal, M/s. Shimada Glass Factory Ltd., 55-58, Konnur High Road, Madras-3. —Chairman.
- (2) Shri N. I. Patel, M/s. K.N. Patel and Company, 7/22, Broadway, Madras-1.
- (3) Shri K. B. Kurup, Manager, M/s. Madras Sheet Glass Works (P) Ltd., Tiruvottiyur, Madras-19.
- (4) Prof. P. B. Janardhan, A. C. College of Technology, University of Madras, Guindy, Madras-25.
- (5) The Branch Manager, Ex-officio State Trading Corp. of India Ltd., 123, Mount Road, Madras-1.
- (6) The Dy. Director (Export Promotion), Ex-officio Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, P.O. Box No. 1482, Madras-1.

NON-MEMBER CONVENER  
The Joint Director, Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, Regional office, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Ernakulam, Cochin-11.

2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.

[No. 6(7)/74-EI&EP]

का० प्रा० 2861 .—निरापेक्ष काच नियम (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1969 के नियम 8 के अनुसरण से और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व विदेश व्यापार तथा संभरण मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 1857 ता० 17 मई, 1969 को अधिष्ठात करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई मांगी के स्तम्भ (2) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को उसके स्तम्भ (1) में दी गई तत्कालीन प्रसिद्धि में उल्लिखित क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकारियों के निर्णय के विमुख उक्त नियम के अधीन अपनी-अपनी के सुनवाई के प्रयोजनार्थ विशेषज्ञों के पैनल के रूप में नियुक्ति करती है ,

परन्तु यह कि जहाँ उक्त किसी पैनल में कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप में हितबद्ध है तो वह उस अपील से संबंधित कार्यवाई में भाग नहीं लेगा।

### भारणी

प्राधिकरण, जिसके निर्णय के विरुद्ध अपील की जा सकती है। विशेषज्ञों का पैनल बनाने वाले व्यक्ति जिनको अपील होगी।

1	2
नियमित निरीक्षण अधिकरण, कलकत्ता	<p>1. डा० एस० एन० प्रसाद, केन्द्रीय काच और चीनी मिट्टी अनुसंधान संस्थान, जायसपुर, कलकत्ता-32. . . अध्यक्ष</p> <p>2. श्री सी० के० सोमानी, मै० हिन्दुस्तान नेशनल ग्लाम मैन्यू० कं० लि०, 2, वेलेजली प्लेस, कलकत्ता-1</p> <p>3. श्री एम० एल० झुमझुनवाला, मै० बंगाल ग्लाम मैन्यू-फैक्टर्स एसोसिएशन, जी-11, मिशनरी एक्सटेशन, कलकत्ता-1</p> <p>4. श्री पी० के० चटर्जी, तकनीकी प्रबंधक, मै० इलेक्ट्रिक सैप मैन्यूफैक्टर्स (भारत) प्रा० लि०, 1, ताराटोला रोड, गार्डन रीथ, कलकत्ता-24</p> <p>5. श्री एन० सी० गुप्ता, मै० विन्डो ग्लाम लि०, डा० एडकोनगर, जिला दुगली (पं० बं०)</p> <p>6. श्री एन० के० अग्रवाल, मै० हिन्दुस्तान सेफ्टी ग्लाम वर्क्स (प्रा०) लि०, 2, सेट आर्जिम गेट रोड, हेमिस्टर्स, कलकत्ता-22</p> <p><b>गैर-सदस्य संयोजक</b> उप-निदेशक (रमा०) पदेन, नियमित निरीक्षण परिषद्, 14/1-बी, एजरा स्ट्रीट, मातबी मंजिल कलकत्ता-1</p>
2. नियमित निरीक्षण अधिकरण बम्बई-1	<p>1. श्री बी० आर० मिदे, मै० कंगन प्रा० लि०, 208 लेडी जमशेदजी रोड, बम्बई-28. . . अध्यक्ष</p> <p>2. श्री एम० पी० सूद, मै० ट्रेन काम एसोसिएट्स, 432, नाहगम क्रोम रोड, बम्बई-31 (बी०डी०)</p>

1

2

3. अवैतनिक सचिव, पदेन, आन ईडिया ग्लास मर्चेन्ट्स एसोसिएशन, 116, अम्बुल रहमान स्ट्रीट, बम्बई-3

4. श्री के० एन० पारीख, मै० वजीर ग्लास वर्क्स लि०, जे० बी० नगर, अन्धेरी, बम्बई-59 (एस)

5. श्री सी० ए० तख्तवाला, श्री वल्लभ ग्लास वर्क्स (प्रा०) लि०, आनन्द, सागी तारा रोड, वल्लभ विधानगर (गुजरात)

6. श्री जे० के० वैद, मै० बोरोसिल ग्लास वर्क्स लि०, 44, खन्ना कन्स्ट्रक्शन हाउस, मोलाना अब्दुल गफार रोड, बरली, बम्बई-18

### गैर-सदस्य संयोजक

संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन, नियमित निरीक्षण परिषद्, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, अमन चैम्बर्स, 113, महर्षि कर्वे रोड, (चौधी मंजिल) बम्बई-4

### 3 नियमित निरीक्षण अधिकरण- दिल्ली

1. निदेशक, पदेन, लघु उद्योग सेवा संस्थान, ओखला, नई दिल्ली . . . अध्यक्ष

2. श्री बी० एन० भासकर, मै० ईश्वर इन्डस्ट्रीज लि०, ईश्वर नगर नई दिल्ली

3. श्री के० सी० बाघण्य, संयुक्त प्रबंधक निदेशक, मै० उ० प्र० वर्क्स लि०, बहजोई (उ० प्र०)

4. श्री एन० एस० माखी, तकनीकी प्रबंधक, मै० हिन्दुस्तान वेक्यूम ग्लाम लि०, फरीदाबाद एन० आई० टी०, हरियाणा।

5. श्री बी० डी० कोठारी, मै० हिन्दुस्तान नेशनल ग्लास एंड इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, बहादुर गढ़ जिला रोहतक (हरियाणा)

6. विकास अधिकारी (ग्लास), पदेन, तकनीकी विकास के महा-निदेशक का कार्यालय, औद्योगिक विकास मंत्रालय,

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies	Persons constituting the panel of experts to which appeal lies
(1)	(2)
I. Export Inspection Agency-Calcutta	(1) Dr. S.N. Prasad, Central Glass & Ceramics Research Institute, Jadavpur, Calcutta-32. ..Chairman.
	(2) Shri C.K. Somany, M/s. Hindustan National Glass Mfg. Co. Ltd., 2, Wellesley Place, Calcutta-1.
	(3) Shri M.L. Jhunjunwala, M/s. Bengal Glass Manufacturers' Association, P-11 Mission Row Extension Calcutta-1.
	(4) Shri P.K. Chatterjee, Technical Manager, M/s. Electric Lamp Manufacturers (I) Pvt. Ltd., 1, Taratolla Road, Garden Reach, Calcutta-24.
	(5) Shri N.C. Gupta, M/s. Window Glass Ltd. P.O. Adconagar, Dist. Hooghly (W.B.).
	(6) Shri N.K. Agarwal, M/s. Hindustan Safety Glass Works (P) Ltd., 2 <sup>nd</sup> St. Georges Gate Road, Hastings, Calcutta-22
II. Export Inspection Agency-Bombay	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Deputy Director (Chem), Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, 14/1B, Ezra Street, 7th floor, Calcutta-1.
	(1) Shri V.R. Bhide, M/s. Kangan Pvt. Ltd., 208 Lady Jamshedji Road, Bombay-28. ..Chairman.
	(2) Shri S.P. Sood, M/s. Tech-Con-Associates, 432 Naigaum Cross Road, Bombay-31(DD)
	(3) The Hony. Secretary, Ex-officio, All India Glass Merchants Association, 116, Abdul Rehman Street, Bombay-3.
	(4) Shri K.N. Parikh, M/s. Vazir Glass Works Ltd., J.B. Nagar, Andheri Bombay-59 (AS).
	(5) Shri C.A. Taktawala, Shri Vallabh Glass Works (P) Ltd., Anand, Sagitara Road, Vallabh Vidyanager (Gujarat).
	(6) Shri J.K. Wad, M/s. Borosil Glass Works Ltd., 44, Khanna Construction House, Maulana Abdul Gaffar Road, Worli, Bombay-18.

1	2
	भारत सरकार, उद्योग भवन, नई दिल्ली-11
	<b>निर-सहस्य संयोजक</b>
	संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, 13/37, प० वि० क्षेत्र, मार्गममाज रोड, नई दिल्ली-5
4. निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण- मद्रास/कोचीन	1. श्री एस० पी० जमाल, मै० शिमवा ग्लास फैक्टरी लि०, 55-58, कोनूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-3 . . . अध्यक्ष
	2. श्री एन० आई० पटेल, मै० के० एन० पटेल, एड क०, 7/22, ब्राड वे, मद्रास-1
	3. प्रो० पी० बी० जनार्दन, मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय, ए० सी० कालिज आफ टक्नोलॉजी, बिल्डिंग्स, गुण्डी, मद्रास-25।
	4. प्रो० के० बी० कुरूप, प्रबंधक, मै० मद्रास गीट ग्लास वर्क्स (प्रा०) लि०, तिरुवत्तूर, मद्रास-19
	5. शाखा प्रबंधक, पदेन, स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कारपोरेशन (भारत) लि०, 123, माउंट रोड, मद्रास-6
	6. उप-निदेशक (नि० सं०) पदेन, आयात और निर्यात के संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक का कार्यालय, पो० बॉक्स सं० 1842, मद्रास-1
	<b>निर-सहस्य संयोजक</b>
	संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् मनोहर बिल्डिंग्स, म० गा० रोड, एनिकुलम, कोचीन-11

पैनल का फोरम तीन का होगा।

[सं० 6(7)/74 -नि० नि० तथा नि० सं०]

**S.O. 2861.**—In pursuance of rule 8 of the Export of Safety Glass (Inspection) Rules, 1969, the Central Government in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Foreign Trade & Supply No. S.O. 1857 dated the 17th May, 1969, hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below as the panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules, against the decision of the Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas mentioned in the corresponding entry in column (1) thereof:

1

2

NON-MEMBER CONVENER

The Joint Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, Regional office Aman Chambers, 113, M. Karve Road (4th floor), Bombay-4.

III. Export Inspection Agency-Delhi

- (1) The Director, Ex-officio Small Industries Service Institute, Okhla, New Delhi. . . Chairman.
- (2) Shri B.N. Bhaskar, M/s. Ishwar Industries Ltd., Ishwar Nagar, New Delhi.
- (3) Shri K.C. Varshnei, Jt. Managing Director, M/s. U.P. Glass Works Ltd., Bahjoi (U.P.).
- (4) Shri N.S. Sokhi, Technical Manager, M/s. Hindustan Vacuum Glass Ltd., Faridabad N.I.T., Haryana.
- (5) Shri B.D. Kothari, M/s. Hindustan National Glass & Industries Ltd., Bahadur Garh, Dist. Rohtak (Haryana).
- (6) The Development Officer (Glass), Ex-officio Office of the Directorate General of Technical Development, Ministry of Industrial Development, Government of India, Udyog Bhavan, New Delhi-11.

NON-MEMBER CONVENER

The Joint Director, Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, Regional office 13/37, W.E.A. Arya Samaj Road, New Delhi-5.

- (1) Shri S.P. Jamal, M/s. Shimada Glass Factory Ltd., 55-58, Konnur High Road, Madras-3. . . Chairman.
- (2) Shri N.I. Patel M/s. K.N. Patel & Co. 7/22, Broad Way, Madras-1.
- (3) Prof. P.B. Janardhan, University of Madras, A.C. College of Technology-Bldgs., Guindy, Madras-25.
- (4) Shri K.B. Kurup, Managar M/s. Madras Sheet Glass Works (P) Ltd., Tiruvottiyur, Madras-19.
- (5) The Branch Manager, Ex-officio, The State Trading Corp. (I) Ltd., 123, Mount Road, Madras-6.
- (6) The Deputy Director (Export Promotion), Ex-officio, Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Post Box No. 1842, Madras-1.

IV. Export Inspection Agency-Madras/Cochin.

1

2

NON-MEMBER CONVENER

The Joint Director, Ex-officio Regional office, Export Inspection Council, Manohar Building, M.G. Road, Ernakulam, Cochin-11.

2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.

[No.6 (7)/74-EI&EP]

का० प्रा० 2862. — कार्बनिक रसायन निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 के नियम 7 के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की अधिवृचना सं० का० प्रा० 688, ता० 24 फरवरी, 1967 को अधिपत्रित करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई मारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को उसके स्तम्भ (1) में दी गई तत्समान प्रविष्टि में उल्लिखित क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकारियों के निर्णय के विरुद्ध उक्त नियम के अधीन अपील की सुनवाई के प्रयोजनार्थ विशेषज्ञों के पैनल के रूप में नियुक्त करती है;

परन्तु यह कि जहां उक्त किसी पैनल में कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितबद्ध है तो उस अपील से संबंधित कार्रवाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा।

सारणी

प्राधिकरण, जिसके निर्णय के विरुद्ध अपील की जा सकती है	विशेषज्ञों का पैनल बनाने वाले व्यक्ति जिनको अपील होगी
1	2
1. भासाम, बिहार, नागालैण्ड, उड़ीसा, पश्चिमी बंगाल, मेघालय, मणिपुर, त्रिपुरा, अंडमान, और निकोबार, अरुणाचल प्रदेश तथा मिजोरम	1. श्री एन० सी० ठक्कर, मे० सी० श्री० ठक्कर एंड कं०, 22, ब्राबोर्न रोड, कलकत्ता-1
टापुआ के राज्यों/केन्द्र प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण।	2. श्री पी० एन० हलदार, मे० बंगाल कैमिकल एंड फार्म-ब्यूटिकल्स वर्क्स लि०, जिला 24 परगना, पं० बं०
	3. डा० टी० गुहा, अल्कली एंड कैमिकल कारपोरेशन, आफ इंडिया लि०, पो० ओ० गिशरा, जिला हुगली।
	4. श्री एम० के० राय, मे० यूनाइटेड एमिड एंड कैमिकल कार्पो०, 83/2, मोतीलाल गुप्ता रोड, कलकत्ता-11
	5. निदेशक, पबेन, भारतीय मानक संस्थान, कलकत्ता विभाग, 5, औरंगी एप्रोच, कलकत्ता-13
	6. उप-निदेशक (कैमिकल), पबेन, नेशनल टैस्ट हाउस, भारत सरकार, 11/1, जजिस कोर्ट रोड कलकत्ता-27

1

2

1. भासाम, बिहार, नागालैण्ड, उड़ीसा, पश्चिमी बंगाल, मेघालय, मणिपुर, त्रिपुरा, अंडमान, और निकोबार, अरुणाचल प्रदेश तथा मिजोरम
- टापुआ के राज्यों/केन्द्र प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण।

1. श्री एन० सी० ठक्कर, मे० सी० श्री० ठक्कर एंड कं०, 22, ब्राबोर्न रोड, कलकत्ता-1
2. श्री पी० एन० हलदार, मे० बंगाल कैमिकल एंड फार्म-ब्यूटिकल्स वर्क्स लि०, जिला 24 परगना, पं० बं०
3. डा० टी० गुहा, अल्कली एंड कैमिकल कारपोरेशन, आफ इंडिया लि०, पो० ओ० गिशरा, जिला हुगली।
4. श्री एम० के० राय, मे० यूनाइटेड एमिड एंड कैमिकल कार्पो०, 83/2, मोतीलाल गुप्ता रोड, कलकत्ता-11
5. निदेशक, पबेन, भारतीय मानक संस्थान, कलकत्ता विभाग, 5, औरंगी एप्रोच, कलकत्ता-13
6. उप-निदेशक (कैमिकल), पबेन, नेशनल टैस्ट हाउस, भारत सरकार, 11/1, जजिस कोर्ट रोड कलकत्ता-27



1

2

1

2

## गैर-सदस्य संयोजक :

उप-निदेशक (रसा०), पदेन  
निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्,  
14/1-बी, एजरा स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1

2. गुजरात, महाराष्ट्र, गोआ, वमन  
और दीऊ, दावरा और नगर हवेली  
के राज्य/केन्द्र प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत  
आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने  
वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण।

1. डा० आर० सी० घसीन,  
मै० पैरायूटिक्स कैमिकल रिसर्च  
फार्मेशन, 95, मार्गण्ड रोड,  
बम्बई-8 — अध्यक्ष

2. श्री के० के० चाया, मै० एक्सल  
इंडस्ट्रीज, 184/187, स्वामी  
विवेकानन्द रोड, जोगेश्वरी,  
बम्बई-60

3. डा० एम० बी० नायक,  
मै० गोल्डन कैमिकल्स,  
'टूबैको हाऊस',  
विले पारले, बम्बई-56

4. श्री एम० चटर्जी, चीफ केमिस्ट,  
मै० भारत पलबराहजिंग मिल्स  
प्रा० लि०, 389, सायासी रोड,  
बम्बई-25

5. निदेशक, पदेन  
भारतीय मानक संस्थान, नाबटो  
पैम्बर्स, ग्रांट रोड, बम्बई-7

6. उप-निदेशक इंचार्ज, पदेन,  
नेशनल टेस्ट हाउस, भारत सरकार  
गौतम बिल्डिंग, जकरिया बन्दर  
रोड, सेवरी, बम्बई-15

## गैर-सदस्य संयोजक :

संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन,  
निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्, क्षेत्रीय  
कार्यालय, 113, महर्षि कर्वे रोड,  
बम्बई-4

3. हरियाणा, जम्मू और कश्मीर,  
मध्य प्रदेश, पंजाब, राजस्थान,  
उत्तर प्रदेश, वेङ्गली, चंडीगढ़ और  
हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्य/केन्द्र  
प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों  
में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण  
अधिकरण।

1. श्री टी० आर० पारीख,  
मै० डी० सी० एम० कैमिकल  
वर्क्स, नाज बिल्डिंग, 1, शंभूबाबा  
एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली

2. श्री सन्तोष सिंह— अध्यक्ष,  
मै० नेशनल कैमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज  
(प्रा०) लि०, 26, नजफगढ़ रोड,  
नई दिल्ली-15

3. श्री ए० एस० गोबर,  
उत्पादन प्रबंधक,  
मै० रेमबेक्सी लेबोरेट्रीज लि०,  
शोखला इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया,  
नई दिल्ली-20

4. श्री रमेश चन्द्र बरार,  
जनरल मैनेजर (आर० एंड डी०),  
मै० न्यूकेम प्लास्टिक लि०,  
54, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया,  
फरीदाबाद, हरियाणा।

5. श्री के० मनियानन,  
तकनीकी विशेषज्ञ  
(कैमिकल अभियांत्रिक), उद्योग  
निदेशालय का कार्यालय, हरियाणा,  
चंडीगढ़

6. उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार का औद्योगिक  
रसायनज्ञ पदेन, एच० बी० तक-  
नीकी संस्थान सबाब गंज, कानपुर

## गैर-सदस्य संयोजक :

संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन  
निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्, क्षेत्रीय  
कार्यालय, 13/37, पश्चिमी विस्तार  
क्षेत्र, भार्यसमाज रोड,  
नई दिल्ली-5

4. केरल, कर्नाटक, तमिलनाडु, आंध्र  
प्रदेश, लक्षद्वीपी टापुओं तथा  
पांडुचेरी के राज्य/केन्द्र प्रदेशों के  
अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरी-  
क्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण।

1. श्री बी० परमेश्वरन नायर,  
वर्क्स मैनेजर,  
मै० इंडियन रेयर धर्म्स लि०,  
'उद्योग संकल्प', पी० ओ० भालवेयी,  
केरल

2. श्री एस० एन० कार्तिकेयान,  
रसायन, अध्यक्ष, मै० ई०आई०  
डी० पी० लि०, रानी पैठ,  
नार्थ आरकाट, तमिलनाडु

3. श्री के० एस० रंगराज,  
मै० कोथारी (मद्रास) लि०,  
20, नगमबक्कम हाई रोड,  
मद्रास-34

4. श्री एस० आर० नागपाल,  
प्रबन्धक निदेशक,  
मै० नागपाल अम्बेडी पैट्रो कैम  
रिफाइनिंग लि०, मनासी, मद्रास-68

5. डा० जोमफ जेवियर,  
रिसर्च आफिसर,  
दी फर्टिलाइजर्स एंड कैमिकल्स  
ट्रावन्कोर लि० उद्योग मंडल,  
पो० आ० एलवेयी, केरल

6. निदेशक, पदेन  
भारतीय मानक संस्थान, 54,  
जनरल पैटरस रोड, मद्रास-2

## गैर-सदस्य संयोजक :

उप-निदेशक, पदेन, निर्यात  
निरीक्षण अधिकरण, मद्रास, 123,  
मार्जेट रोड, मद्रास-6।

2 पैल का कोरम तीन का होगा।

[सं० 6(7)/74-नि० तथा नि० सं०]

**S.O. 2362.**—In pursuance of rule 7 of the Export of Organic Chemicals (Inspection) Rules, 1966, the Central Government in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 688, dated the 24th February, 1967, hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below as panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules against the decision of the Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas mentioned in the corresponding entry in column (1) thereof:

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal, he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies	Persons constituting the panels of experts to which appellies
--	---

(1)	(2)
I. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Assam, Bihar, Nagaland, Orissa, West Bengal, Meghalaya, Manipur, Tripura, the Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Arunachal Pradesh & Mizoram.	<p>(1) Shri N.C. Thakkar, M/s. C.D. Thakkar &amp; Co., 22, Brabourne Road, Calcutta-1. —Chairman.</p> <p>(2) Shri P.N. Haldar, M/s. Bengal Chemical and Pharmaceuticals Works Ltd., Panihati, Dist. 24-Parganas, W.B.</p> <p>(3) Dr. T. Guha, The Alkali &amp; Chemical Corp. of India Ltd., P.O. Rishra, Dist. Hooghly.</p> <p>(4) Shri S.K. Roy, M/s. United Acid and Chemical Corporation, 83/2, Motilal Gupta Road, Calcutta-41.</p> <p>(5) The Director, Ex-officio Indian Standards Institution, Calcutta Branch, 5, Chowringhee Approach, Calcutta-13.</p> <p>(6) The Deputy Director (Chem.), Ex-officio National Test House, Government of India, 11/1, Judge's Court Road, Calcutta-27.</p>
NON-MEMBER CONVENER	
The Deputy Director (Chem.), Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, 14/1B, Ezra Street, Calcutta-1.	
II. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Goa, Daman & Diu, Dadra & Nagar Haveli.	<p>(1) Dr. R.C. Amin, M/s. Therapeutics Chemical Research Corporation, 95, Morland Road, Bombay-8. —Chairman.</p> <p>(2) Shri K.K. Chayya, M/s. Excel Industries, 184/187, Swami Vivekananda Road, Jogeshwari, Bombay-60.</p> <p>(3) Dr. M.V. Nayak, M/s. Golden Chemicals, 'Tobacco House', Vile Parle, Bombay-56.</p> <p>(4) Shri S. Chatterjee, Chief Chemist, M/s. Bharat Pulverising Mills Pvt. Ltd., 389, Sayani Road, Bombay-25.</p>

(1)	(2)
(5) The Director, Ex-officio Indian Standards Institution, 'Novelty Chambers', Grant Road, Bombay-7.	
(6) The Dy. Director-in-Charge, Ex-officio National Test House, Government of India, Gautam Building, Zakaria Bunder Road, Sewree, Bombay-15.	
NON-MEMBER CONVENER	
The Joint Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, Regional Office, 113, M. Karve Road, Bombay-4.	

III. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Delhi, Chandigarh & Himachal Pradesh.

- (1) Shri T.R. Perek, M/s. D.C.M. Chemicals Works, Naaz Building, 1, Jhandewalan Estate, New Delhi. —Chairman.
- (2) Shri Santokh Singh, M/s. National Chemical Industries (Pvt.) Ltd., 26, Najaf Garh Road, New Delhi-15.
- (3) Shri A.S. Grover, Production Manager, M/s. Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd., Okhla Industrial Area, New Delhi-20.
- (4) Shri Ramesh C. Barar, General Manager (R & D) M/s. Nuchem Plastics Ltd., 54, Industrial Area, Faridabad, Haryana.
- (5) Shri K. Maniannan, Technical Expert (Chemical Engineering), Office of the Directorate of Industries, Haryana, Chandigarh.
- (6) Industrial Chemist to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, Ex-officio H.B. Technological Institute, Nawab Ganj, Kanpur.

## NON-MEMBER CONVENER

The Joint Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, Regional Office, 13/37, Western Extn. Area, Arya Samaj Road, New Delhi-5.

- IV. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Lakshadivi Islands and Pondicherry.
- (1) Shri B. Parameshwaran Nair, Works Manager, M/s. Indian Rare Earths Ltd., Udyogamandal P.O. Alwaye, Kerala. —Chairman.
- (2) Shri S.N. Karthikeyan, Chemical Supdt., M/s. E.I.D. Parry Ltd., Ranipet, North Arcot, Tamil Nadu.
- (3) Shri K.S. Rangraj, M/s. Kothari (Madras) Ltd., 20, Nungambakkam High Road, Madras-34.
- (4) Shri S.R. Nagpal, Managing Director, M/s. Nagpal Ambadi Petro Chem. Refining Ltd. Manali, Madras-68.

(1)	(2)	1	2
	(5) Dr. Joseph Xavier, Research Officer, The Fertilizers and Chemicals, Travancore Ltd., Udyogmandal, P.O. Alwaye, Kerala.		5 निदेशक, पदेन, भारतीय मानक संस्थान, कलकत्ता, शाखा 5, चौरंगी एप्रोष, कलकत्ता-13
	(6) The Director, Ex-officio, Indian Standards Institution, 54, General Patters Road, Madras-2.		6 उप-निदेशक (कैमिकल), पदेन, नेशनल स्टैंड ह्राऊस, भारत सरकार, 11/1, जजिस कोर्ट रोड, कलकत्ता-27
	NON-MEMBER CONVENER The Deputy Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Agency-Madras, 123, Mount Road, Madras-6.		गैर-सदस्य संयोजक उप-निदेश (रसा०) पदेन निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्, 14/1-बी, एञ्जरा स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1

## 2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.

[No.6(7)/74-EI&amp;EP]

क्रा० प्रा० 2863.—अकार्बनिक रसायन निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 के नियम 7 के अनुसरण में, और भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० क्रा० आ० 599, ता० 16 फरवरी, 1967, को अधिकांत करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को उसके स्तम्भ (1) में दी गई तत्समान प्रविष्टि में उल्लिखित क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरणों के निर्णय के विरुद्ध उक्त नियम के अधीन अपील की सुनवाई के प्रयोजनार्थ विशेषज्ञों के पैनल के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

परन्तु यह कि जहाँ उक्त किसी पैनल में कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितबद्ध है तो वह अपील उस से संबंधित कार्यवाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा।

## सारणी

प्राधिकरण, जिसके निर्णय के विरुद्ध विशेषज्ञों का पैनल बनाने वाले अपील की जा सकती है व्यक्ति जिनको अपील होगी

1	2
I आसाम, बिहार, नागालैण्ड उड़ीसा, पश्चिमी बंगाल, मेघालय, मणिपुर, त्रिपुरा, अरुणाचल प्रदेश तथा मिजोरम टापुओं राज्य/केन्द्र प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण।	1 श्री एन० सी० ठक्कर, मै० सी० डी० ठक्कर एड० क०, 22, ब्राबोर्न रोड, कलकत्ता-1 अध्यक्ष 2 श्री पी० एन० हुलवार, मै० बंगाल कैमिकल्स एड० फर्मेन्टु-टिक्ल्स बर्क्स लि०, जिला / 24 परगाना, प०ब० 3 डा० टी० गुहा, मल्कापी एड० कैमिकल कारपोरेशन, भाफ इंडिया लि०, पो० प्रो० रिशरा जिला हुगली। 4 श्री एस० के० राय, मै० युनाइ-टिड एंजिड एंड कैमिकल कार्पो, 83/2 मोतीलाल गुप्ता रोड, कलकत्ता-11

II गुजरात, महाराष्ट्र, गोआ, वमन धौर वीऊ, बाबरा तथा नगर हवेली के राज्य/केन्द्र प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण।

- डा० आर० सी० अमीन, मै० पैराक्यटिकल कैमिकल रिसर्च कार्पोरेशन, 95, मोरलैड रोड, बम्बई-8—अध्यक्ष
- श्री के० के० घाया, मै० एक्सल इंडस्ट्रीज, 184/187, स्वामी विवेकानन्द रोड, जोशेश्वरी, बम्बई-60
- डा० एम० सी० नायक, मै० गोरुडन कैमिकल्स, दुबेको हाऊस, विने पारले, बम्बई-56
- श्री एम० चटर्जी, चीफ केमिस्ट, मै० भारत फलवराइजिंग मिल्स प्रा० लि०, 389, सायानी रोड, बम्बई-25
- निदेशक, पदेन भारतीय मानक संस्थान, "भाबल्टो चैम्बर्स," प्रांट रोड, बम्बई-7
- उप-निदेशक इन्चार्ज, पदेन, नेशनल स्टैंड ह्राऊस, भारत सरकार, गौतम बिल्डिंग, जकारिया बन्दर रोड, सेबरी, बम्बई-15

## गैर-सदस्य संयोजक

संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, 113, महर्षि कर्वे रोड, बम्बई-4

III हरियाणा, जम्मू और कश्मीर, मध्य प्रदेश, पंजाब, राजस्थान उत्तर प्रदेश, वेहली, कण्डीगढ़ और हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यों/केन्द्रीय प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण।

- श्री टी० आर० पारीख, मै० डी० सी० एम० कैमिकल वर्क्स, नाज बिल्डिंग, 1, साहेबाला एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली—अध्यक्ष
- श्री सन्तोष सिंह, मै० नेशनल कैमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, 26, मजफगढ़ रोड, नई दिल्ली-15

1	2
	3. श्री ए० एस० श्रोवर, उत्पादन प्रबन्धक मै०, रेनबैकसी लेबो-रेट्रीज लि०, प्रोबला इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, नई दिल्ली-20.
	4. श्री रमेश चन्द्र बरार, जनरल मैनेजर (ग्रार० एंड सी) मै० न्यूकैम प्लास्टिक लि०, 54, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, फरीदाबाद, हरियाणा।
	5. श्री के० मनियानल, तकनीकी विशेषज्ञ, (कैमिकल अभियांत्रिक), उद्योग निदेशालय का कार्यालय, हरियाणा, चण्डीगढ़।
	6. उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार का औद्योगिक रसायन पदेन एच०बी० तकनीकी संस्थान, नवाब गंज, कानपुर।
	गैर-सदस्य संयोजक :
	संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, 13/37, पश्चिमी विस्तार क्षेत्र, आर्य-समाज रोड, नई दिल्ली-5
IV. केरल, कर्नाटक, तमिलनाडु, आन्ध्र प्रदेश लक्कादीवी टापुओं तथा पांडुचेरी के राज्य/केन्द्र प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण।	1. श्री बी० परमेश्वरन नायर, वक्र्स मैनेजर, मै० इंडियन रेयर ग्रुप्स लि०, उद्योग मंडल पी० ओ० आलवेयी, केरल—अध्यक्ष
	2. श्री एस० एन० कार्तिकेयान, रसायन अध्यक्ष, मै० ई० आई०, डी० पैरी लि०, रानी पेट नार्थ प्रारकाट तमिलनाडु।
	3. श्री के० एस० रंगराज, मै० कोथारी (मद्रास) लि०, 20, नागमन्नकम हाई रोड, मद्रास-35.
	4. श्री एस० आर० नागपाल, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, मै० नागपाल अम्बेडी पैट्रॉल कम रिफाइनिंग लि० मनाली, मद्रास-68.
	5. डा० जोसफ जेवियर, रिसर्च आफिसर, वी फर्टीलाइजर्स एंड कैमिकल्स, ड्रावनकोर लि० उद्योग मंडल, पी० ओ० एलवेयी केरल।
	6. निदेशक, पदेन, भारतीय मानक संस्थान, 54, जनरल पैटरस रोड, मद्रास-2.

1	2
	गैर-सदस्य संयोजक :
	7. उप-निदेशक, पदेन, निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण- मद्रास, 123, माउंट रोड, मद्रास-6
(2) पैनल की कोरम तीन का होगा।	[सं० 6(7)74-नि० तथा नि० सं०]

S.O. 2863—In pursuance of rule 7 of the Export of Inorganic Chemicals (Inspection) Rules, 1966, the Central Government in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 599, dated the 16th February, 1967, hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below as panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rule, against the decision of the Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas mentioned in the corresponding entry in column (1) thereof:

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal, he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies	Persons constituting the panels of experts to which appeal lies
(1)	(2)
I Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Assam, Bihar, Nagaland Orissa, West Bengal, Meghalaya, Manipu, Tripura, the Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram.	(1) Shri N.C. Thakkar, M/s. C.D. Thakkar & Co., 22, Brabourne Road, Calcutta-1. —Chairman. (2) Shri P.N. Haldar, M/s. Bengal Chemical and Pharmaceuticals Works Ltd., Panhati, Dist. 24-Parganas, W.B. (3) Dr. T. Guha, The Alkali & Chemical Corpn. of (I) Ltd., P.O. Rishra, Dist. Hooghly. (4) Shri S.K. Roy, M/s. United Acid and Chemical Corporation, 83/2, Motilal Gupta, Road, Calcutta-41. (5) The Director, Ex-officio Indian Standards Institution, Calcutta Branch, 5, Chowringhee Approach, Calcutta-13. (6) The Deputy Director (Chem), Ex-officio, National Test House, Government of India, 11/1, Judge's Court Road, Calcutta-27.
II. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Gujarat, Maharashtra,	1. Dr. R.C. Amin, M/s. Therapeutic Chemical Research Corporation, 95, Morland Road, Bombay-8. ...Chairman.

NON-MEMBER CONVENER  
The Deputy Director (Chem),  
Ex-officio Export Inspection  
Council, 14/1B, Ezra Street,  
Calcutta-1.

(1)	(2)
Goa, Daman & Diu, Dadra & Nagar Haveli.	2. Shri K. K. Chayya, M/s. Excel Industries, 184/187, Swami Vivekananda Road, Jogeshwari, Bombay-60.
	3. Dr. M. V. Nayak, M/s. Golden Chemicals, 'Tobacco House', Vile Parle, Bombay-56.
	4. Shri S. Chatterjee, Chief Chemist, M/s. Bharat Pulverising Mills Pvt. Ltd., 389, Sayani Road, Bombay-25.
	5. The Director, Ex-officio Indian Standards Institution, 'Novelty Chambers', Grant Road, Bombay-7.
	6. The Deputy Director-in-Charge, Ex-officio National Test House, Government of India, Gautam Building, Zakaria Bunder Road, Sewree, Bombay-15.
<b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Joint Director, Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, Regional office, Aman Chambers, 113, M. Karve Road, Bombay-4.	

III. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union Territories of Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Delhi, Chandigarh and Himachal Pradesh.

1. Shri T.R. Pareek, M/s. D.C.M. Chemical Works, Naaz Building, 1, Jhandewalan Estate, New Delhi.  
.....Chairman.
2. Shri Santokh Singh, M/s. National Chemical Industries (Pvt.) Ltd., 26, Najaf Garh Road, New Delhi-15.
3. Shri A.S. Grover, Production Manager, M/s. Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd., Okhla Industrial Area, New Delhi-20.
4. Shri Ramash C. Brar, General Manager (R&D), M/s. Nuohom Plastics Ltd., 45, Industrial Area, Faridabad, Haryana.
5. Shri K. Manivannan, Technical Expert (Chemical Engineering), Office of the Directorate of Industries, Haryana, Chandigarh.
6. Industrial Chemist to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, Ex-officio H.B. Technological Institute, Nawab Ganj, Kanpur.

**NON MEMBER CONVENER**  
The Joint Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, Regional Office 13/37, W. E.A. Arya Samaj Road, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-5.

IV. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Lakshadivi Islands and Pondicherry.

1. Shri B. Parmeshwaran Nair, Works Manager, M/s. Indian Rare Earths Ltd., Udyogmandal, P.O. Alwaye, Kerala.  
.....Chairman.
2. Shri S.N. Karthikeyan, Chemical Supdt., M/s. E.I.D. Parry Ltd., Ranipet, North Arcot, Tamil Nadu.

(1)	(2)
	3. Shri K.S. Rangraj, M/s. Kothari (Madras) Ltd., 20, Nungambakkam High Road, Madras-34.
	4. Shri S.R. Nagpal, Managing Director, M/s. Nagpal Ambadi Petro-Chem Refining Ltd. Minali Madras-68.
	5. Dr. Joseph Xavier, Research Officer, The Fertilizers and Chemicals Travancore Ltd., Udyogmandal, P. O. Alwaye, Kerala.
	6. The Director, Ex-officio, Indian Standards Institution, 54, General Patters Road, Madras-2.
<b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Deputy Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Agency-Madras, 123, Mount Road, Madras-6.	

2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.

[No. 6(7)/74-EI&EP.]

का० आ० 2864.—धुलाई मासुन नियत (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 के नियम 7 के अनुमरण में भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1718-ख, ता० 9 मई 1967 को अधि-क्रांत करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को उसके स्तम्भ (1) में दी गई तत्समान प्रवृत्ति में उल्लिखित क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरणों के निर्णय के विरुद्ध उक्त नियम के अधीन अपीलों की सुनवाई के प्रयोजनार्थ विशेषज्ञों के पैनल के रूप में नियुक्त करती है:—

परन्तु यह कि जहां उक्त किसी पैनल में कोई सदस्य किसी अपील की विषय वस्तु में वैयक्तिक रूप से हितबद्ध है तो वह उस अपील से संबंधित कार्यवाहियों में भाग नहीं लेगा।

#### सारणी

प्राधिकरण जिसके निर्णय के विरुद्ध विशेषज्ञों का पैनल बनाने वाले अपील की जा सकेगी।

व्यक्ति जिनको अपील होगी

1	2
1. ग्रामाम, बिहार, मणीपुर, मेघालय, नागालैंड तथा उड़ीसा, त्रिपुरा, पश्चिमी बंगाल, अरुणाचल प्रदेश मिजोरम तथा अंडमान निकोबार द्वीपों के केन्द्रीय शासित प्रदेशों राज्यों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अधिकरण।	1. श्री मोती लाल साहू, मै० कुमुम उत्पादन लि० पी० ए० रिशारा, हुगली प० ब०—अध्यक्ष 2. श्री एम० सी० घोष, मै० गिसिर सोप वर्क्स, 12/1, जैसोर रोड, डम-डम, 24 परगना। 3. श्री एम० बी० सेठ, मै० रसोई बनस्पति फैक्टरी, 1, स्टेशन रोड, कलकत्ता-53। 4. श्री डी० के० दत्ता, रसायन अभियान्त्रिकी के प्रो० जाधवपुर विश्व-विद्यालय, कलकत्ता-32।

1	2	1	2
	<p>5. श्री के० एस० परशुराम, प्रयोग-शाला प्रबन्धक, मै० हिन्दुस्तान लीवर लि०, 63, गार्डन रोड, कलकत्ता-24।</p> <p>6. उप-निदेशक (रसा०) पदेन, नेशनल टेस्ट हाऊस, भारत सरकार, 11/1, जजिम कोर्ट रोड, कलकत्ता-27।</p> <p>गैर-सदस्य संयोजक : उप-निदेशक (रसा०) पदेन, नियमित निरीक्षण परिषद्, 14/1-बी, एञ्जरा स्ट्रीट (सातवीं मंजिल) कलकत्ता-1।</p>		<p>3. श्री पी० प्रार० डी० दुआ, रसायन विभाग के अध्यक्ष, टेक्नालाजी का भारतीय संस्थान, नई दिल्ली-16।</p> <p>4. श्री एन० एम० शेटी, प्रबन्धक, गनेश, फ्लोर मिल्स कं० लि०, पो० बाक्स सं० 2182 मन्जी मंडी, दिल्ली-7।</p> <p>5. श्री बी० धप्पु राव, क्वालिटी नियंत्रण अधिकारी, टाटा प्रायल मिल्स कं० लि०, सोनी रोड, पो० धो० मोहन नगर, गाजियाबाद, उ० प्र०।</p> <p>6. उ०प्र० सरकार के प्रायल विशेषज्ञ पदेन हाईकोर्टबटलर टेक्ना-जोकील इन्स्टीट्यूट, कानपुर, उ० प्र०।</p> <p>गैर-सदस्य संयोजक : संयुक्त निदेशक, नियमित निरीक्षण परिषद्, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय 13/37, प०वि० क्षेत्र, प्रार्य समाज रोड, नई दिल्ली-5।</p>
II. गुजरात, महाराष्ट्र, वादरा तथा	<p>1. श्री एन० जी० लवाडे, मै० गोद-रेज सोप (प्रा०) लि० ईस्टर्न एक्सप्रेस हाईवे, बिछरोली, बम्बई-79-प्रध्यक्ष।</p> <p>2. डा० एस० एम० पटेल, प्रयोग-शाला प्रबन्धक, मै० हिन्दुस्तान लीवर लि०, हाजी बन्वर, सेवरी, बम्बई-15।</p> <p>3. श्री एम० ए० मट्ट, उत्पादन निदेशक, मै० स्वास्तिक प्रायल मिल्स, पोस्ट बाक्स सं० 363, शाही बाग हाऊस, 13, बालचंन होराचन्द मार्ग, बम्बई-1।</p> <p>4. श्री अजीज ए० मादनी, मै० बम्बई सोप फैक्टरी, अहमद उमर स्ट्रीट, बम्बई-8।</p> <p>5. डा० जे० जी० केन, प्रायल टेक्नालाजी डिवाइज के अध्यक्ष, रसायन टेक्नालाजी का विभाग, बम्बई, बिणवविद्यालय माटुंगा, बम्बई।</p> <p>6. उप-निदेशक, इन्वार्ज, पदेन, नेशनल टेस्ट हाऊस, भारत सरकार, जकारिया बन्वर रोड, बम्बई-15।</p> <p>गैर-सदस्य संयोजक : संयुक्त निदेशक, पदेन, नियमित निरीक्षण परिषद् क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, अमन बैम्बर्स, 113, महर्षि कर्बे रोड, बम्बई-4।</p>	IV. आन्ध्र प्रदेश, केरल, कर्नाटक,	<p>1. डा० डी० बैक्टेरवरलु, रसायन अभियांत्रिकी शिक्षा विकास केन्द्र, टेक्नालाजी का भारतीय संस्थान, मद्रास-36।</p> <p>2. श्री बी० जयपा, महाप्रबन्धक, सरकारी माबुन फैक्टरी, पो० बाक्स सं० 5531, बेगपुर-55।</p> <p>3. श्री सी० प्रार० रेड्डी, टाटा प्रायल मिल्स कं० लि०, सं० 18 प्रौर 22, एलया मुड्डे स्ट्रीट, टोनडिप्रारपेट, मद्रास-81।</p> <p>4. श्री यू० ए० कृष्णा, मै० ताज सोप बक्स, 383 ए, टी० एच० रोड, मद्रास-81।</p> <p>5. श्री टी० बाबू शेट्टी, मै० नेशनल इंडस्ट्रीज 216, टी० एच० रोड, मद्रास-81।</p> <p>6. उप-निदेशक (नि०सं०) प्रायल प्रौर नियमित के संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक का कार्यालय, पो० बाक्स सं० 1842, मद्रास-1।</p> <p>गैर-सदस्य संयोजक : उप-निदेशक, पदेन, नियमित निरीक्षण अभिकरण-मद्रास, 123, भार्कट रोड, मद्रास-6।</p>
III. हरियाणा, जम्मू तथा कश्मीर,	<p>1. श्री एस० डी० गुप्ता, मुख्य रसायनज्ञ, मै० मोदी बनास्पति मैनुफैक्चरिंग कं०, मोदी नगर, मेरठ, उ० प्र०—प्रध्यक्ष।</p> <p>2. श्री टी० प्रार० पारीख, मै० डी० भी० एम० रसायन बक्स, माज बिल्डिंग, 1-सबेयाना एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-1।</p>	तमिल नाडु, पाण्डेचेरी, लक्का-दीवी द्वीपों के राज्यों/केन्द्र प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अभिकरण।	<p>2. पैनेल का कोरम तीन का होगा।</p>
मध्य प्रदेश, पंजाब, राजस्थान, उत्तर प्रदेश, दिल्ली, चंडीगढ़ तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यों/केन्द्रीय प्रदेशों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्रों में निरीक्षण करने वाले निरीक्षण अभिकरण।			<p>[सं० 6(7)/74-नि०वि० तथा नि० सं० के० भी० बालसुब्रमण्यन, उप-निदेशक</p>

S.O. 2864. —In pursuance of rule 7 of the Export of Laundry Soap (Inspection) Rules, 1966, the Central Government in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 1718-B, dated the 9th May, 1967, hereby appoints the persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table given below as the panel of experts for the purpose of hearing appeals under the said rules, against the decision of the Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas mentioned in the corresponding entry in column (1) thereof :

Provided that where a member of any of the said panel is personally interested in the subject matter of any appeal he shall not take part in the proceedings relating to that appeal.

TABLE

Authority against whose decision appeal lies	Persons constituting the panel of experts to which appeal lies
(1)	(2)
1. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Assam, Bihar, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Orissa, Tripura, West Bengal, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.	<p>1. Shri Moti Lal Sahu, M/s. Kusum Products Ltd., P.O. Rishra, Hooghly, W.B. Chairman.</p> <p>2. Shri S.C. Ghose, M/s. Sisir Soap Works, 12/1, Jessore Road, Dum Dum, 24-Parganas.</p> <p>3. Shri S.B. Seth, M/s. Rasoi Vanaspati Factory 1, Station Road, Calcutta-53.</p> <p>4. Shri D.K. Dutta, Prof. of Chemical Engineering Jadavpur University, Calcutta-32.</p> <p>5. Shri K.S. Parasuram, Laboratory Manager, M/s. Hindustan Lever Limited, 63, Garden Reach, Calcutta-24.</p> <p>6. The Deputy Director (Chem.), Ex-officio, National Test House, Govt. of India, 11/1 Judge's Court Road, Calcutta-27.</p> <p><b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Deputy Director (Chem.), Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, 14/1B, Ezra Street (7th Floor), Calcutta-1.</p>
II. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Goa, Daman & Diu.	<p>1. Shri N.G. Lawande, M/s. Godrej Soaps (Pvt.) Ltd., Eastern Express High Way, Vikhroli, Bombay-79—Chairman.</p> <p>2. Dr. S.M. Petal, Laboratory Manager, M/s. Hindustan Lever Limited, Haji Bunder, Sewri, Bombay-15.</p> <p>3. Shri M.A. Bhatt, Production Director, M/s. Swastick Oil Mills, Post Box No. 362, Shahibag House, 13, Walchand Hirchand Marg, Bombay-1.</p> <p>4. Shri Aziz A. Madni, M/s. Bombay Soap Factory, Ahmed Omer Street, Bombay-8.</p> <p>5. Dr. J.G. Kane, Head of the Oil Technology Divn., Department of Chemical Technology, University of Bombay, Matunga, Bombay.</p> <p>6. The Deputy Director-in-Charge, Ex-officio National Test House, Govt. of India, India, Zakaria Bunder Road, Bombay-15.</p>

(1)	(2)
	<b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Joint Director, Ex-officio, Export Inspection Council, Regional office, Aman Chambers, 113, M. Karve Road, bay-4.
III. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Delhi, Chandigarh and Himachal Pradesh.	<p>1. Shri S.D. Gupta, Chief Chemist, M/s. Modi Vanaspati Manufacturing Co., Modi Nagar, Meerut, U.P. Chairman.</p> <p>2. Shri T. Pareek, M/s. D.C.M. Chemical Works, Naaz Building 1, Jhandewalan Estate, New Delhi-1. Chairman.</p> <p>3. Prof. R.D. Dua, Head of the Chemistry Department, Indian Institute of Technology, New Delhi-16.</p> <p>4. Shri N.M. Setty, Manager, The Ganesh Flour Mills Co. Ltd., Post Box No. 2182, Subzi Mandi, Delhi 7.</p> <p>5. Shri B. Appu Rao, Quality Control Officer, The Tata Oil Mills Co. Ltd., Loni Road, P.O. Mohan Nagar, Ghaziabad, U.P.</p> <p>6. The Oil Expert to U.P. Government Ex-officio Harcourt Butler Technological Institute, Kanpur, U.P.</p> <p><b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Joint Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Council, Regional office, 13/37, W. E.A. Arya Samaj Road, New Delhi-5.</p>
IV. Inspection Agencies carrying out inspection in the areas covered by the States/Union territories of Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry and the Laccadivi, Minicoy and Admindivi Islands.	<p>1. Dr. D. Vankateswarlu, Chemical Engineering Education Development Centre, Indian Institute of Technology, Madras-36. Chairman.</p> <p>2. Shri V. Jayappa, General Manager, Government Soap Factory, Post Box No. 5531, Bangalore-55.</p> <p>3. Shri C.R. Reddy, the Tata Oil Mills Co. Ltd., No. 18 and 22, Elaiya Mudaly Street Tondiarpet, Madras-81.</p> <p>4. Shri U.A. Krishna, M/s. Tej Soap Works, 383-A, T.H. Road, Madras-81.</p> <p>5. Shri D. Bangaru Chetty, M/s. National Industries, 216, T.H. Road, Madras-81.</p> <p>6. The Deputy Director (Export Promotion), Ex-officio Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Post Box No. 1842, Madras-1.</p> <p><b>NON-MEMBER CONVENER</b> The Deputy Director, Ex-officio Export Inspection Agency-Madras, 123, Mount Road, Madras-6.</p>

2. The quorum of the panel shall be three.

[No. 6(7)/74-EI&EP]

K. V. BALASUBRAMANIAN,  
Deputy Director

(मुख्य निर्यातक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली दिनांक, 10 सितम्बर, 1974

क्रा०प्र० 2865—डा० बी० के० श्रीवास्तव एक एम बी 220/8, 1971 मॉडल कार के आयात के लिए 30,000 रुपये मूल्य का सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट सं पी/जे/3045767/एन/एम पी/50/एच/37-38 दिनांक 10-1-74 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट की अनुलिपि प्रति के लिए आवेदन किया है क्योंकि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट खो गया है। यह भी उल्लेख किया गया है कि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट किसी भी सीमाशुल्क कार्यालय में पंजीकृत नहीं किया गया था और उसका उपयोग नहीं किया गया था।

इस तर्क के समर्थन में डा० बी० के० श्रीवास्तव ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। उन्होंने यह वचन दिया है कि यदि सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट बाव में पाया गया तो वह इस कार्यालय को रिपोर्ट के लिए लौटा दिया जाएगा। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट सं पी/जे/3045767/एन पी/50/एच/37-38 दिनांक 10-1-74 को खो गया है और निदेश देता हूँ कि इसकी अनुलिपि प्रति उसकी जारी की जानी चाहिए। मूल सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट रद्द किया गया समझा जाए।

[फ० सं० 2 (बी-185)/73-74/बी एल एम/1914]

क० जी० नारायण मिश्रा, उप-मुख्य निर्यातक

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th September, 1974

S.O. 2865.—Dr. V. K. Srivastava was granted Customs Clearance Permit No. P/J/3045767/N/MP/50/H/37-38 dated 10-1-74 for Rs. 30,000 for import of a M.B. 220/8, 1971 Model car has applied for a duplicate copy of the Customs Clearance Permit as the original Customs Clearance Permit has been lost. It is further stated that the original Customs Clearance Permit was not registered with any Custom House and utilised

In support of this contention Dr. V. K. Srivastava has filed an affidavit. He has undertaken to return the Customs Clearance Permit if traced later to this office for record. I am satisfied that the original Customs Clearance Permit No. P/J/3045767/N/MP/50/H/37-38 dated 10-1-74 has been lost and direct that a duplicate Customs Clearance Permit should be issued to him. The original Customs Clearance Permit may be treated as cancelled.

[File No. 2 (B-185)/73-74/BLS/1914]

Sd. Illegible

K. G. NARAINSINGHANI, Dy. Chief Controller

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 11 अक्टूबर, 1974

क्रा०प्र० 2866—मकश्री श्री बल्लभ ग्लान घर्से लिमिटेड, बल्लभ विधानगर (गुजरात) की सामान्य मुद्रा क्षेत्र के अन्तर्गत (1) प्राकृतिक पत्थर पीसने वाले रोलर (मैचटक) मूल्य 30,000 रुपये एवं (2) फालतू पुर्जे मूल्य 30,000 रुपये के आयात के लिये 60,000 रुपये का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/डी/2193892 दिनांक 30-7-73 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने इस कार्यालय से लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि प्रतियों (सीमाशुल्क तथा मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण दोनों प्रतियों) के लिये इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क तथा मुद्रा विनियम

नियंत्रण प्रतियाँ उपयोग किए बिना ही खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और यह लाइसेंस किसी भी सीमाशुल्क समूहकर्ता के पास पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया गया है।

2. अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि मूल लाइसेंस सं० पी/डी/2193892 दिनांक 30-7-73 (सीमाशुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण दोनों प्रतियाँ) खो गया/अस्थानस्थ हो गया है और निदेश देता है उन्हें उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रक प्रतियाँ जारी की जानी चाहिए। मूल लाइसेंस को प्रतियों में एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

[सं० ग्लान-1(1)/ए० एम० 74/आर० एम० 3/1177]

एन० सी० कान्जिलाल, उप-मुख्य निर्यातक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th October, 1974

S.O. 2866.—M/s. Shree Vallabh Glass Works Limited, Vallabh Vidya Nagar, (Gujarat) were granted Import Licence No. P/D/2193892 dated 30-7-73 for the import of (i) Natural Stone Grinding Roller (Components) valued at Rs. 30,000 and (ii) Spare Parts for Rs. 30,000 total Rs. 60,000 under G.C.A. They have requested this office for issue of duplicate copies of the licence (both Customs and Exchange Control Purposes) on the grounds that the original Customs and Exchange Control Copies of the licence have been lost/misplaced without having been utilised at all and that this licence has not been registered with any of the Collector of Customs.

2 In support of their contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Licence No. P/D/2193892 dated 30-7-73 (both Customs and Exchange Control Copies) has been lost/misplaced and directs that duplicate Customs and Exchange Control Copies of the said licence should be issued to them. The Original licence in duplicate is hereby Cancelled.

[No. Glass-1(1)/A.M. 74/R.M. 3/1177]

N. C. KANJILAL, Dy. Chief Controller

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 14 अक्टूबर, 1974

क्रा०प्र० 2867—सर्वश्री ऊषा इलेक्ट्रोनिक्स (इण्डिया) प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, 2, ग्रान्द नोक नई दिल्ली-49 को प्लास्टिक फिल्म कैपेसिटर्स के विनिर्माण के लिये कच्चे माल के आयात के लिये सामान्य मुद्रा क्षेत्र और रुपये में भुगतान क्षेत्र के अन्तर्गत 1,87,500 रुपये और 62,500 रुपये के मूल्य के लिये क्रमशः आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/डी/1403605/सी/एक्स एक्स/52/एच/37-38/रेडियो तथा पी/डी/1403606/टी/सी आर/52/एच/37-38/रेडियो दोनों का दिनांक 9-9-74 प्रदान किये गये थे।

2. पार्टी ने उक्त लाइसेंसों की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर अनुरोध किया है कि उन्होंने मूल लाइसेंस प्राप्त नहीं किये हैं।

3 अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी संतुष्ट है कि पार्टी ने मूल आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/डी/1403605 तथा 1403606 दिनांक 9-9-74 प्राप्त नहीं किया है और निदेश देता है कि उक्त लाइसेंसों की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क



प्रयोजन प्रति एक मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति आवेदक को जारी की जाती चाहिए। लाइसेंसों की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति एक मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति का रद्द किया जाता है।

1. लाइसेंसों की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति एक मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या रेडियो/12/1/74-75/आर एम -]

आई० वी० चून्कत, उप मुख्य नियंत्रक

इसे मुख्य नियंत्रक

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 14th October, 1974

**S.O. 2867.**—M/s. Usha Electronics (India) Pvt. Ltd., 2, Anand Lok, New Delhi-49 were granted Import Licence No. P/D/1403605/C/XX/52/H/37-38/Radio and P/D/1403606/T/OR/52/H/37-38/Radio both dated 9-9-74 under GCA and RPA for Import of Raw Materials for the manufacture of Plastic Film Capacitors valued at Rs. 1,87,500 & Rs. 62,500/- respectively.

2. The party have requested for the issue of duplicate Customs Purposes Copy and Exchange Control Purposes Copy of the above said licences on the ground that the original licences have not been received by them.

3. In support of their contention, the applicants have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Import Licences No. P/D/1403605 & 1403606 dated 9-9-1974 have not been received by the party and directs that Duplicate Customs Purposes Copy and Exchange Control Purposes Copy of the said licences should be issued to the applicant. The original Customs Purposes Copy and Exchange Control Purposes Copy of the licences are cancelled.

4. The Duplicate Customs Purposes Copy and Exchange Control Purposes Copy of the licences are being issued separately.

[No. Radio/12/1/74-75/RM. II]

I. V. CHUNKATH, Dy. Chief Controller  
for Chief Controller.

आवेदन

नई दिल्ली 10 अक्टूबर, 1974

**क्र० आ० 2868**—दि स्पेस एप्लिकेशन सेन्टर, भारतीय अन्तरिक्ष अनुसंधान संघटन, अहमदाबाद को आइसोप्रोम व्यू फास्टर पलम्बीकान कैमरा सेन जूस लैन्स आदि मजिन के लिये 7,42,720 रु० का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० जी/प/1059679 दिनांक 8-5-73 स्वीकृत किया गया था। स्पेस एप्लिकेशन सेन्टर ने प्रतिवेदित किया है कि लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क प्रति पारगमन में खो गई है और उन्होंने उसी की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने के लिये अनुरोध किया है।

अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी सन्तुष्ट है कि लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क प्रति खो गई है और निदेश देती है कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क प्रति जारी की जाए।

लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रति रद्द कर दी गई है। उसी की अनुलिपि प्रति अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या आई-266/आई एन एम टी/74-73/आई एल एम/पी एल एम/बी]

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th October, 1974

**S.O. 2868.**—The space Application Centre, Indian Space Research Organisation, Ahmedabad was granted licence No. 91 GI/74—60.

G/A/1059679 dated 8-5-73 for Rs. 7,42,720 for the import of Monochrome View Finder Plumbicon Camera Chain with Zoom lens etc. Space Applications Centre has reported that customs copy of the licence has been lost in transit and they have requested to issue duplicate copy of the same.

In support of their contention the applicant has filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the customs copy of the licence has been lost and directs that the duplicate copy of the said licence be issued.

The original customs copy of the licence has been cancelled. A duplicate copy of the same is being issued separately.

By Order,

[No I-266/INST/72-73/ILS/PLS/B]

आई०

नई दिल्ली, 11 अक्टूबर, 1974

**क्र० आ० 2869**—महेश्वरी इण्डियन आयल कारपोरेशन लि० (मार्केटिंग इंडीजन) बम्बई को 22,11,210 रुपये (बाईस लाख एकतासीस हजार दो सौ दस रुपये) मूल्य का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० जी०/ए०/डी/2006041 दिनांक 11-1-73 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति खो गई/अस्थायित्व हो गई है। आगे यह उल्लेख किया गया है कि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति सीमाशुल्क गार्यन्त, बम्बई में पंजीकृत कराई थी और उसका आंशिक उपयोग किया गया था। इसका 21,35,562 रुपये के लिए उपयोग किया गया था और इस पर 21-11-73 को 1,05,638 रुपये का उपयोग करना शेष था।

2. इस तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने महाराष्ट्र राज्य के नोटरी के एक पत्र के साथ शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है। तदनुसार मैं सन्तुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति खो गई है। इसलिए, यथासंशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की उप-धारा 9 (सी सी) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करने हुए महेश्वरी इण्डियन आयल कारपोरेशन लि० (मार्केटिंग इंडीजन), बम्बई को जारी किए गए लाइसेंस सं० जी०/ए०/डी/2006041 दिनांक 11-1-73 की उक्त मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

3. लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति की अनुलिपि लाइसेंसधारी को अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[सं० इन्स्ट/81/72-73 पी एल एस(ए)]

एस० के० उस्मानी, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

इसे मुख्य नियंत्रक

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 14th October, 1974

**S.O. 2869.**—M/s Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (Marketing Divin.) Bombay were granted an import licence No. G/AD/2006041 dated 11-1-73 for Rs. 22,41,210/- (Rupees Twentytwo lakhs, fortyone thousand, two hundred and ten only). They have applied for the issue of a duplicate Customs Purposes copy of the said licence on the ground that the original Customs Purposes copy has been lost/misplaced. It is further stated that the original Customs Purposes copy was registered with the Customs authorities at Bombay and utilised partly.

It was utilised for Rs 21,35,562/- and the balance available on it was Rs 1,05,638/- as on 21-11-73.

In support of this contention the applicant has filed an affidavit along with a certificate from the Notary Maharashtra State I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs Purposes copy of the said licence has been lost. Therefore in exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-clause 9(cc) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-55 as amended the said original Customs Purposes copy of licence No. G/AD/2006041 dated 11-1-73 issued to M/s. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (M. Divn.) Bombay is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs Purposes copy of the said licence is being issued separately to the licensee.

[No. Ind/81/72-73/PLS(A)]

S. K. USMANI, Dy. Chief Controller  
For Chief Controller.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार नियोजन मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 17 अक्टूबर, 1974

क्रा० प्रा० 2870.—यः उस्मानिया विश्वविद्यालय में दन्त चिकित्सक अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 16) की धारा 3 के खण्ड (ब) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में उस्मानिया मेडिकल कालेज हैदराबाद के चिकित्सा विज्ञान संस्थान के डेंटल विंग में प्राध्यापक डा० रामचन्द्र रेड्डी पी०, बी०डी०एस० एम० डी० एम० को 5 अगस्त, 1974 से डा० ताजाम्मुल हुसैन के स्थान पर, जो उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (3) के अधीन परिवर्तन के मध्य नहीं रहे, भारतीय दन्त परिषद् का सदस्य निर्वाचित किया है;

अतः, अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भूतपूर्व स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय में भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना संख्या 3-2/62-एम०-ii दिनांक 17 अक्टूबर, 1962 में निम्नलिखित आगे और संशोधन करती है, नामतः—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, "धारा 3 के खण्ड (ब) के अधीन निर्वाचित" शीर्षक के अन्तर्गत क्रम संख्या 7 पर वर्तमान प्रविष्टि के बदले निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रख दी जाये, नामतः—

"डा० रामचन्द्र रेड्डी पी०, बी०डी०एस०, एम०डी०एस०,  
प्राध्यापक, डेंटल विंग,  
चिकित्सा विज्ञान संस्थान,  
उस्मानिया मेडिकल कालेज,  
हैदराबाद।"

[सं० बी० 12013/1/74-एम० पी० टी०]

सती नायर, अवर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF HEALTH & FAMILY PLANNING

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 17th October, 1974

S.O. 2870.—Whereas the Osmania University has, in pursuance of the Provisions of Clause (d) of section 3 of the Dentists Act, 1948 (16 of 1948), elected Dr. Ramachandra Reddy, P., BDS, MDS, Professor, Dental Wing, Institute of Medical Sciences, Osmania Medical College, Hyderabad, to be a member of the Dental Council of India with effect from the 5th August, 1974 vice Dr. Tajammul Husain, who has ceased to be the member of the Council under sub-section (3) of section 6 of the Act;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Health No. 3-2/62-MII, dated the 17th October, 1962, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading "Elected under clause (d) of section 3", against serial No. 7, for the existing entry, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"Dr. Ramachandra Reddy P., BDS, MDS, Professor, Dental Wing, Institute of Medical Sciences, Osmania Medical College, Hyderabad."

[No. V. 12013/1/74-MPT]

MRS. SATHI NAIR, Under Secy.

कृषि मंत्रालय

(सहकारिता विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 6 सितम्बर, 1974

क्रा० प्रा० 2871.—बहु-इकाई सहकारी सोसायटी अधिनियम, 1942 (1942 का 6) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के कृषि मंत्रालय (सहकारिता विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या एफ० 7/27/66-क्रा० प्रा०, तारीख 18 अगस्त, 1971 की अधिक्रान्त करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार कृषि मंत्रालय (सहकारिता विभाग) में संयुक्त सचिव श्री ए० दास को सहकारी सोसाइटियों के केन्द्रीय रजिस्ट्रार के रूप में एतद्वारा नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० 7/27/66-सं० क्रि०]

श्री० श्रीनिवासन, उप सचिव

## MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

(Department of Cooperation)

New Delhi, the 6th September, 1974

S.O. 2871.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 4 of the Multi-Unit Cooperative Societies Act, 1942 (6 of 1942) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Agriculture, (Department of Cooperative) No. F. 7/27/66-Coord., dated the 18th August, 1971, the Central Government hereby appoint Shri A. Das, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Cooperation), as the Central Registrar of Cooperative Societies.

[No. 7-27/66-CL]

R. SRINIVASAN, Dy. Secy.

पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 15 अक्टूबर, 1974

क्रा० प्रा० 2872.—अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विमान पत्तन प्राधिकारी अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 43वां) के खण्ड 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा मिश्रिकम में मुख्य प्रशासक श्री बी० एस० दास को 1 अक्टूबर, 1974 से भारत के अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विमान-पत्तन प्राधिकरण में श्री एस० रामनाथन के स्थान पर पूर्णकालिक सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० ए० 11013/8/71-प्रशासन]

सी० एल० डीगरा, उप सचिव

## MINISTRY OF TOURISM & CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 15th October, 1974

S.O. 2872.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the International Airports Authority Act, 1971, (43 of

1971), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri B S Das, Chief Executive in Sikkim as a whole time Member of the International Airports Authority of India, with effect from the 1st October 1974 vice Shri S Ramanathan

[No A-11013/8/71-Admn]

C I DHINGRA, Dy Secy

. नौवहन और परिवहन मन्त्रालय

(परिवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 15 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2873—डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 5-क की उप धारा (3) और (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियाँ का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा कप्तान डी० वी० सिंह को काडला डाक श्रम बोर्ड के सदस्य नियुक्त करती है और उन्हें 28 जून, 1974 से उक्त बोर्ड का अध्यक्ष मनोनीत करती है और भूतपूर्व श्रम रोजगार और पुनर्वास मन्त्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० प्रा० 3805, दिनांक 26 अक्टूबर 1968 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् —

उक्त अधिसूचना में—

- (1) केन्द्रीय सरकार का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले सदस्य शीर्षक के नीचे सद (1) के मामले की प्रविष्टि के लिये निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात् —  
कप्तान डी० वी० सिंह, अध्यक्ष, काडला पत्तन न्यास गांधीधाम,
- (11) उक्त अधिसूचना के पैरा 2 में श्री ई० जी० डी० मेलो शब्दों और वर्णों के स्थान पर कप्तान डी० वी० सिंह शब्द और वर्ण प्रतिस्थापित किये जाएंगे।

व्याख्यात्मक आपन

कप्तान डी० वी० सिंह 19-6-1974 से 27-6-1974 तक के लिए छुट्टी पर चले गए और श्री ई० जी० डी० मेलो मुख्य इजीनियर, काडला पत्तन न्यास ने अपने कार्य के प्रतिरिक्त 19 जून, 1974 से 27 जून, 1974 तक के लिए अध्यक्ष, काडला पत्तन न्यास का कार्यभार सम्भाल लिया। इस प्रकार श्री ई० जी० डी० मेलो को 19 जून, 1974 से 27 जून, 1974 तक अध्यक्ष, काडला डाक श्रम बोर्ड के तौर पर नियुक्त किया जा रहा है। श्री ई० जी० डी० मेलो की इस प्रकार भूतलक्षी प्रभाव से नियुक्ति के फलस्वरूप किसी तीसरे व्यक्ति के हित को कोई हानि नहीं पहुँचेगी।

[स० वी० 17012/1/72-पी एण्ड डी/एल० डी-(11)]

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi the 15th October, 1974

**S.O. 2873.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (3) and (4) of section 5A of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints Captain D V Singh as a member of the Kandla Dock Labour Board and nominates him as the Chairman of the said Board with effect from 28th June, 1974 and makes the following further amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No 3805 dated 26th October, 1968, namely

In the said notification—

- (i) under the heading "Members representing the Central Government" for the entry against item (1), the following entry shall be substituted, namely —  
"Captain D V Singh, Chairman, Kandla Port Trust, Gandhidham",
- (ii) in paragraph 2 of the said notification for the words and letters, "Shri E G D 'Mello'" the words and letters 'Captain D V Singh' shall be substituted

#### EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

On return from leave, Captain D V Singh, Chairman, Kandla Port Trust, resumed charge of the post of Chairman, with effect from 28th June, 1974. Captain D V Singh, is being appointed as the Chairman Kandla Dock Labour Board from 28th June, 1974. No third person's interests would be adversely affected by giving such retrospective effect to the appointment of Captain D V Singh

[No V-17012/1/72-P&D/LD-(11)]

का० प्रा० 2874—डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 5-क की उपधारा (3) और (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री ई० जी० डी० मेलो को काडला डाक श्रम बोर्ड के सदस्य नियुक्त करती है और छुट्टी पर गये कप्तान डी० वी० सिंह के स्थान पर 19 जून, 1974 से 27 जून, 1974 तक की अवधि के लिये उक्त बोर्ड का अध्यक्ष मनोनीत करती है, और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम रोजगार और पुनर्वास मन्त्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० प्रा० 3805, दिनांक 26 अक्टूबर, 1968 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् —

उक्त अधिसूचना में—

- (I) केन्द्रीय सरकार का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात् —  
'श्री ई० जी० डी० मेलो, मुख्य इजीनियर, काडला पत्तन न्यास, गांधीधाम।'
- (II) उक्त अधिसूचना के पैरा 2 में, कप्तान डी० वी० सिंह शब्दों और वर्णों के स्थान पर कप्तान डी० वी० सिंह शब्द और वर्ण प्रतिस्थापित किये जाएंगे।

व्याख्यात्मक आपन

छुट्टी से लौटने पर, कप्तान डी० वी० सिंह अध्यक्ष, काडला पत्तन न्यास, ने 28 जून, 1974 से अध्यक्ष पद का कार्यभार सम्भाल लिया। कप्तान डी० वी० सिंह 28 जून, 1974 से अध्यक्ष, काडला डाक श्रम बोर्ड नियुक्त किये जा रहे हैं। कप्तान डी० वी० सिंह की इस प्रकार भूतलक्षी प्रभाव से नियुक्ति के फलस्वरूप किसी तीसरे व्यक्ति के हित को कोई हानि नहीं पहुँचेगी।

[स० वी०-17012/1/72-पी० एण्ड डी०/एल० डी० (1)]

वी० शर्करालगम अवर सचिव

**S.O. 2874.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (3) and (4) of section 5A of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri E G D 'Mello' as a member of the Kandla Dock Labour Board and nominates him the Chairman of the said Board from 19th June, 1974 to 27th June 1974 vice Capt D V Singh, on leave and makes the following further amendments in the notification

of Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 3805 dated 26th October, 1968, namely—

In the said notification—

- (i) under the heading "Members representing the Central Government" for the entry against item (1), the following entry shall be substituted namely:—

"Shri F. G. D'Mellow Chief Engineer, Kandla Port Trust, Gandhidham";

- (ii) in paragraph 2 of the said notification for the words and the letters "Capt. D. V. Singh", the words and the letters "Shri E. G. D'Mellow" shall be substituted.

#### EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

Capt. D. V. Singh proceeded on leave from 19-6-1974 to 27-6-1974. Shri E. G. D'Mello, Chief Engineer, Kandla Port Trust from 19th June, 1974 to 27th June, 1974 in addition to his duties. As such, Shri E. G. D'Mello is being appointed as the Chairman, Kandla Dock Labour Board with effect from 19th June, 1974 to 27th June, 1974. No third person's interests would be adversely affected by giving such retrospective effect to the appointment of Shri E. G. D'Mello.

[No. V-17012/1/72-P&D/LD(i)]

V. SANKARALINGAM, Under Secy.

रेल मंत्रालय

(रेलवे बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 24 सितम्बर, 1974

क्रा० प्रा० 2873.—सांख्यिक परिसर (प्रतियुक्त अधिसूची वेधखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित तालिका के कालम (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारियों को, सरकार के राज-पत्रित अधिकारी होने के नाते, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए सम्यक् अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है और आगे यह निदेश करती है कि ऐसे अधिकारी अपने अधिकार क्षेत्र की सीमाओं के भीतर निम्नलिखित तालिका के कालम (2) के अन्तर्गत निर्धारित सांख्यिक परिसरों के सम्बन्ध में उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन अध्यादेश द्वारा सम्यक् अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों एवं कार्यों का क्रमशः प्रयोग और निष्पादन करेंगे।

तालिका

अधिकारियों के पदनाम	सांख्यिक परिसरों की श्रेणियों और अधिकार-क्षेत्र की सीमाएं
1	2
1. फिरोजपुर, बीकानेर, जोधपुर, फिरोजपुर, बीकानेर, जोधपुर, मुरादाबाद और लखनऊ मण्डलों के अधीक्षण इंजीनियर (इंजीनियरिंग विभाग के कनिष्ठ प्रशासनिक अधिकारी)	मुरादाबाद और लखनऊ मण्डलों के अधीकार-क्षेत्र के भीतर उत्तर रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन परिसर।

[क्रा० प्रा० 114/उत्तर 2/1970 ई०/13]

अमल नाम गुप्ता, सचिव

MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Railway Board)

New Delhi, 24th September, 1974.

S.O. 2875.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction Unauthorised Occupants)

Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the Officers mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being gazetted officers of Government, to be estate officers for the purposes of the said Act, and further directs that the said officers shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on estate officers by or under the said Act, within the local limits of their jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

Designation of the officers.	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction.
1	2
1. Divisional Superintending Engineers, (Junior Administrative officers of Engineering Department), Ferozepore, Bikaner, Jodhpur, Moradabad and Lucknow Divisions.	Premises under the administrative control of the Northern Railway situated within the jurisdiction of Ferozepore, Bikaner, Jodhpur, Moradabad and Lucknow Divisions.

[File No. 69/W2/LE/13]

A. L. GUPTA, Secy

#### MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 16th October, 1974

S.O. 2876.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the arbitrator in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Beas Sutlej Link Project, Sundernagar and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th October, 1974.

[BEFORE SHRI SHYAM KRISHNA, REGIONAL LABOUR COMMISSIONER (CENTRAL), KANPUR AND ARBITRATOR]

Arbitration Award under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in the matter of industrial dispute between the management of Beas Sutlej Link Project, Sunder Nagar and Beas Sutlej Link Workers Union, Sundernagar regarding alleged wrong fixation of pay of Shri Vishwa Mitter Special Foreman.

PRESENT:

*Representing the management*

1. Shri Harbans Singh, S.D.O., B.S.L. Project, Sundernagar,

*Representing workman*

2. Shri M. S. Toggar, President, B.S.L. Workers Union, Sunder Nagar,  
3. Shri N. P. Sharma, General Secretary, B. S. L. Workers Union, Sundernagar.

#### AWARD

By an Arbitration agreement dated 13-4-1974 published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3, Sub-Section II as per Government of India in the Ministry of Labour Orders No. L-42012/21/74/LR, III dated 10th May, 1974, the Superintending Engineer, (Administration and Accounts), Beas—Sutlej Link Project, Sundernagar and the President, Beas Sutlej Link Workers Union, Sundernagar referred the following specific matters in the dispute to my Arbitration under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The agreement inter alia provided that the decision of the Arbitrator shall be binding on them :

"Whether the Management of Beas Sutlej Link Project Sundernagar is justified in denying a Basic Pay of Rs. 450.00 P.M. to Shri Vishwa Mitter, T. No. 155-M with effect from 1st February, 1972? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

The Superintending Engineer, (Administration and Accounts) Beas Sutlej Link Project, Sundernagar and the President, Beas Sutlej Link Workers Union, Sundernagar (hereinafter called as "Management" and "Union" respectively) were requested vide my letter No. K. 129(9)/74 dated 17/18-6-1974 to furnish me a self-contained statement of their case within 10 days of the receipt of the aforesaid letter endorsing simultaneously a copy thereof to the opposite party, they were further requested that on receipt of a copy of the statement from the opposite party they should furnish their comments thereon within 10 days of its receipt endorsing a copy simultaneously to the other party. The union sent their claim statement to me on 1-7-1974 under letter No. MISC/440-41 dated 1-7-1974 endorsing a copy thereof to the management which was received by the management on 24-7-1974. The Management submitted rejoinder to the union's claim statement 21-9-1974 with copy to the union which was received by the Union on 21-9-1974. Since, however, no rejoinder had been received from the management till 28-8-1974, personal hearing was fixed by me for 21-9-1974 vide my letter No. K 129(9)/74 dated 28-8-1974.

In the statement of claim and during the hearing the union stated that Shri Vishwa Mitter was appointed as Assistant Foreman Special on 1-6-1965 by the Management in the pay scale of Rs. 200—10—280—15—430—20—450. He was promoted from the said post to the post of Foreman Special w.e.f. 1-2-1972 in the grade of Rs. 350—15—380—20—500—20—600 and was fixed at Rs. 420 p.m. which was wrong for the reasons that the instructions No. 413-14/BPA/61/18 dated 6-1-1966 of the General Manager and Secretary to the Government of Punjab Beas Project Administration, Talwara Township to the Chief Engineer, Beas Sutlej Link Project Nangal Township and Superintending Engineer, Admn. & Stores Beas Dam Talwara Township etc. had not been followed by the Management while doing so. It was added that on 31-1-1972 he was getting Rs. 415 p.m. in the old scale of Rs. 200—450 as Assistant Foreman Special. As per Punjab Government instructions cited above the fixation should have been done keeping in view Fundamental Rule 22-C and given starting salary of Rs. 450 p.m. w.e.f. 1-2-1972 and subsequent increment at the rate of Rs. 20 p.m. per year thereafter which has not been given.

The Management in the rejoinder and during the hearing admitted that Shri Vishwa Mitter was appointed as Assistant Foreman Special w.e.f. 1-6-1965 in the Project but his pay scale was Rs. 210—300 which was later on revised w.e.f. 1-1-1970 to Rs. 200—450. At the time of promotion as Foreman Special his pay was shown as Rs. 400 p.m. by Sub-Divisional Officer of the Project and so he was given starting salary of Rs. 420 p.m. w.e.f. 1-2-1972. The pay scale of Foreman Special was admitted to be the same as mentioned by the Union. The Instructions of the Punjab Government cited by the Union viz. 413-14/DPA/61/18 dated 6-1-1966 which relates to the promotion made on seniority-cum-merit basis and not to those which were made on competition along with fresh recruits as happened in the case of Shri Vishwa Mitter who was given test card to compete along with the outsiders and promoted having been found fit to the post of Foreman Special. The past service rendered by Shri Vishwa Mitter as Assistant Foreman Special was continued to be recognised for the purpose of length of service for promotion and there was no break in the service. As such the question of application of Fundamental Rule 22-C to the instant case did not arise.

As will be seen from the above facts, only issues to be framed and decided in this dispute are (1) What basic salary Shri Vishwa Mitter was getting on 31-1-1972 as Assistant Foreman Special (2) Whether fixation of Shri Vishwa Mitter as Foreman Special should have been done keeping in view Fundamental Rule 22-C w.e.f. 1-2-1972 thereby making him eligible for fixation at higher basic salary and future increments. So far as the first issue is concerned all service records including pay sheets remained in the custody of the management and so the management could only be competent body to indicate the exact basic pay which Shri Vishwa Mitter was getting on 31-1-1972. The Management in this connection simply filed a copy of promotion statement of departmental candidates of Electrical Division No. II Pandoh as proposed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Personnel Sub Division and approved by the Superintending Engineer (Administration and Accounts), Beas Sutlej Link

Project, Sundernagar Township showing that Shri Vishwa Mitter was getting Rs. 400 as Assistant Foreman Special which was proposed to be revised to Rs. 420 in the scale of Rs. 350—600 as Foreman Special. This simple statement could not be adduced to be sufficient and reliable evidence to show that the basic pay of Shri Vishwa Mitter was Rs. 400 on 31-1-1972. In support of actual salary the management should have exhibited pay sheet showing last pay paid to the employee for the month of January, 1972 or his service records which are supposed to be indicative thereof. Thus the management have not done so I have no alternative but to rely on the Union's claim that Shri Vishwa Mitter was getting Rs. 415 as Assistant Foreman Special on 31-1-1972.

Now coming to the second issue whether Fundamental Rule 22-C should have been made applicable in this case while fixing basic salary of Shri Vishwa Mitter as Foreman Special w.e.f. 1-2-1972, the instructions given by the General Manager and Secretary to Government of Punjab Beas Project Admn. Talwara Township to the Chief Engineer, Beas Sutlej Link Project Nangal Township and Superintending Engineer, Admn. & Stores Beas Dam Talwara Township etc. as referred to above clearly show that the fixation of pay of the workers when appointed on promotion to higher category will be regulated as per Government of India Fundamental Rule 22-C. The said instructions had no discrimination between the workers promoted through test card along with fresh recruits or promoted on the basis of seniority-cum-fitness etc. as a matter of routine. Therefore Management's arguments that since Shri Vishwa Mitter has been promoted on the basis of test card which was not regular promotion the provisions of Fundamental Rule 22-C could not be attracted in the case of workman for the purpose of fixation as Foreman Special is hardly tenable.

I therefore hold that taking the basic salary of Shri Vishwa Mitter as Rs. 415 as Assistant Foreman Special on 31-1-1972, keeping in view the provisions of Fundamental Rule 22-C, the workman Shri Vishwa Mitter fixed at Rs. 440 p.m. w.e.f. 1-2-1972 and I Award accordingly.

SHYAM KRISHNA, Regional Labour Commissioner

[No. L. 42012/21/74/LRIII]

New Delhi, the 17th October, 1974

**S.O. 2877.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the arbitrator in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Food Corporation of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 15th October, 1974.

BEFORE SHRI K. K. MITRA, ARBITRATOR.

In the matter of a reference under Section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, in respect of an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Food Corporation of India, Bihar Region, Patna, within the Eastern Zone, Calcutta and their workmen, represented by the Food Corporation of India, Workers' Union, Calcutta.

AND

In the matter of Order No. L.42013/1/73/IR II dated April 6, 1973 read with order No. L.42013/1/73/IRIII dated September 12, 1973 in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment).

APPEARANCES.

On behalf of employers:—Mr. A. K. Dutt, Advocate with Mr. M. N. Roy, Advocate and then Mr. B. P. Banerjee, Advocate.

On behalf of workmen.—Mr. D. L. Sengupta, Advocate.

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation sent to me a copy of their notification dated April, 6, 1973 intimating about the publication of a notification in the Gazette of India in pursuance of Sub-Section (3) of Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 enclosing in it the arbitration agreement executed by the parties in an industrial dispute in terms of the provision of Sub-Section (1) of Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947.

The arbitration agreement as per rules is drawn by the parties and is duly signed by Sri B. K. Singh, the Regional Manager, Food Corporation of India, Patna, as representing the employer that is the Food Corporation of India and by Sri G. S. Jana, Joint Secretary, Food Corporation of India Workers' Union as representing the workmen through the Food Corporation of India Workers Union. The employer and the workmen agreed to refer the industrial dispute existing between them to arbitration by me, as named in the arbitration agreement, after obtaining my consent to act as arbitrator, as laid down under Section 7 of the Industrial Dispute Act Rules.

The specific matter in dispute, enumerated in the aforesaid notification are as follows:—

1. (a) What should be the workload of an individual handling mazdoor/gang & munshis and ancillary mazdoor/in a shift of eight hours at the P. S. Depots, Gaya, Mokameh and Jamshedpur.
- (b) What should be the incentive scheme of sardars, munshis, mondals and handling mazdoor.
2. What should be the wage structure of departmentalised workers in Bihar depot.
3. What should be the fringe benefit of the aforesaid workers.
4. What should be the strength of the handling mazdoors at the aforesaid depots having regard to the workload and the average operational requirement there.

The total number of workmen employed in the undertaking as are affected or likely to be affected by the decision of the dispute had been mentioned to be 640, in the notification.

I was subsequently informed by the Food Corporation of India, as per letter No. A-50(19)/73—Labour dated the June 8, 1973 that the parties have agreed and decided to include an additional point of issue in the reference case which is being incorporated as an addendum and the specified matter in dispute, which shall be under clause 2(a) as "fallback wages in a month and the conditions for entitlement in respect of ancillary workers".

The parties decided to proceed for adjudication of the dispute through me. At the first sitting it had been so suggested by the employer i.e., the F.C.I. that the proceedings would be conducted by the parties themselves and that no lawyer would be engaged and the Union agreed. Subsequently, however, the employer decided otherwise and prayed for conducting the case with the assistance of lawyers. The employer duly filed letter of authority in favour of lawyer, Mr. A. K. Dutt, Advocate and Mr. M. N. Roy, Advocate. Parties then filed their statements, as directed.

From the statement filed by the Union, it is gathered that the public sector organisation of Food Corporation of India came into operation in 1964 by an Act of 1964 of the Parliament and it carries on its business in procurement, storage and distribution of food grain throughout the country. It has been functioning through four zonal officers, having zonal manager at the head of each of such administration in the north, east, west and south regions. The zones in their turn are divided into regions and districts, for the convenience of

administration of F.C.I.—the districts are in charge of administration under district managers. Each district has got under it several depots usually managed by Assistant Manager. The F.C.I. has about 79.76 lakh tonnes of storage capacity in the depots owned and possessed by it.

The eastern zone with which we are concerned in the present dispute comprises of West Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Assam, Tripura, Nagaland, Meghalaya, Arunachal and there are about 20,000 workmen employed in the several depots in this region. The union claims that it represents the entire body of these workmen engaged in storage and distribution work in this region.

The Union had been carrying on its activities for securing a fair deal for the workmen. It could be possible through the efforts of the Union to redress the grievances of the workmen to a considerable extent in West Bengal, in the matter of wage structure and fringe benefits for the workmen—such as sardar, mondal/munshi, handling labour, ancillary labour (male and female). But unfortunately the workmen employed in Bihar, at the Mokameh, Gaya and Jamshedpur depots did not get even such benefit in wages etc. as those employed in West Bengal.

The workmen numbering 640 out of 948 employed at the depots in Bihar that is at Gaya, Mokameh and Jamshedpur had been departmentalised by the Government on 1-5-71 whereas their counterparts in West Bengal were departmentalised some time before on 15-1-70. Before departmentalisation the workmen did not enjoy any benefit in the matter of their conditions of service, which had been far from being fair, just and proper. The regional manager of Bihar had, however, agreed that the terms and conditions of service as applicable to the workmen employed in Calcutta depots would be made applicable to those employed in Bihar and a telex communication dated 26-6-71 of which Ex. 'A' is the copy would establish the correctness of such assertion. The terms and conditions of service as applicable to the workmen in Calcutta is given in Annexure 'B' and those in Bihar in annexure 'BB' and the differential and discrimination would be apparent from a comparison of those charts.

The regional manager of Bihar thereafter agreed on 23-3-73 to give the same rates of wages excluding City Compensatory Allowance and House rent allowance to the handling mazdoor in Bihar depots, as in Calcutta but wanted to raise some extraneous points as to fixation of labour strength, transfer etc. But raising of such extraneous questions was completely unjustified, uncalled for and mala fide. It had been agreed between the parties on 11-8-71, that till finalisation of the dispute as to wage structure the workmen would get wages on an ad hoc basis as shown in annexure 'C' and since then every effort had been made by the Union, through bipartite and tripartite conference, to settle the dispute but without any result due to the unsympathetic attitude of the employer. Ultimately parties agreed to have a decision through adjudication, and both parties agreed that I would act as the sole arbitrator and this gave rise to this reference by the appropriate Government in accordance with law specifying the points in dispute requiring adjudication.

It is stated by the Union that the workload of the munshi and the ancillary mazdoor is not fixed and defined anywhere; but they work diligently for seven hours in a day under direct supervision of the authority which acts as a check against idleness or negligence in duty on the part of such workers. The male ancillary workers perform the duties of sweeping spilled cargo, filling up and stitching of bags, loading and unloading of empty gunnies, operating hand trucks, placing cover on stacks, fumigating the food stacks with medicines etc. The female ancillary workers, in their turn perform the duties of repairing the damaged empty gunnies, sweeping of spilled cargo, raising of cargo with the aid of indigenous methods etc.

The task of the munshi is to assist the gang sardars.

It is thus submitted that the issue regarding the workload of individual handling labour/gangs, munshis and ancillary mazdoor should be so decided as providing for 15 heads in a gang including munshi in a shift of 7 hours and that no specific workload excepting what the routine duty required to be performed needs be fixed for munshis and ancillary workers, on the same principle, as obtaining in Calcutta.

Regarding incentive scheme, it is stated that while the handling mazdoors, sardars and mondal enjoy the benefit as to earning extra money, through the incentive scheme in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal there is none such for munshi which is the cause of grievance for such workmen. The Union demands that the corresponding workmen in Bihar depots should get the benefit of earning wages by way of incentive scheme and the scheme in force in West Bengal should be fully extended to them. It is also contended that munshis should get the benefit of incentive wages like the sardars and others in their respective depots. The Union demands that the wage structure of the workmen in the Bihar depots should at least be the same as available to their counterparts doing identical nature of work in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal depots as shown in annexure 'B'. The workers in Bihar are paid fixed wages details of which has been stated in para 18 having no provision for payment of dearness allowance and apparently such wages fall far below Rs. 238 per month which should be the irreducible minimum wages for the lowest paid manual work having a family composition of 3 units at the present level of cost of living index standing at 850 points taking 1939 as the base year. At any rate the discrimination must not be allowed to continue.

Similarly in respect to issue No. 2(b) it is claimed that the workmen in Bihar depots should get the benefit of fallback wages and attendance allowance at the same rate and on the same principle as enjoyed by those counterparts in West Bengal and thus the unjust discrimination, in the conditions of service, between worker and worker, doing the same nature of work, in the two States in the same zone should be removed.

Regarding issue No. 3, it is submitted that the workers in Bihar depots are deprived of various sorts of fringe benefit, which are extended to the workmen of all respectable concerns in the country and the meagre benefit as shown in details in annexure 'BB', should be replaced by those given in annexure 'B', available to the workmen of the F.C.I. employed in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal and the discrimination should be stopped.

Regarding issue No. 4, which relates to fixation of the strength of handling mazdoor in the three Bihar depots, it is submitted that the issue under reference, had been included at the insistence of the employer and is wholly mis-concerned and *malafide*. As a matter of fact, the Union had demanded for the departmentalisation of 948 workmen, working in these depots. But ultimately after negotiations only 640 workmen had been departmentalised on 1-5-71; eliminating the rest. Nevertheless since then the volume of work of the F.C.I. got tremendously increased, when trade in wheat was taken over. Furthermore it is apparent that the volume of work would further increase, when the entire field of trade in food grains would be taken over. It is thus contended that there should be proportionate increase in the strength of handling mazdoor, consistent with the increase in the volume of overall work. It is also submitted that storing of food grains should fairly be done in the F.C.I. godowns and only when that is not so possible, storing could be permitted to be done through the medium of private storing agents. Thus, having regards to the operational requirement consistent with workload 1280 workmen that is double of 640, should be fixed as the required strength of handling mazdoors, as the present strength is insufficient. So far as the ancillary workers in the Bihar depots are concerned the Union claims that they should be given the same benefits as to fallback wages and other amenities, as available to their counterparts in Calcutta, as the nature of duties performed by them as enumerated in para 16, is the same, in Bihar depots as in Calcutta depots.

In short, the claim of the Union is that the terms and conditions of service, as to wage structure, fallback wages and fringe benefit, should be made available to the workers, involved in this proceeding, exactly in the same terms and conditions and in the same rate, as enjoyed by the workmen doing same nature of duties in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal with retrospective effect from 1-5-71.

The Food Corporation of India in their turn filed a statement, along with the Union explaining their viewpoint and in support of their stand in regards to the dispute.

It is submitted therein that the Union started agitation some time before 1970-71 for the abolition of the contract labour system and for departmentalisation of handling and ancillary mazdoors, who were so long working under various contractors and as a result the management temporarily agreed to departmentalise the handling/ancillary mazdoors in the three depots in Bihar and that on the basis of an ad hoc settlement 300, 250, and 90 handling/ancillary mazdoors making in all 640 employed at Mokameh, Gaya and Jamshedpur depots, respectively were departmentalised. The Corporation, had in mind, the idea of deploying surplus hands to other food storage depots in the Bihar region of F.C.I. The handling of food grain work, is essentially a team work comprising of loading and unloading of food grains, weighment, stacking, counting of stacks, rebagging, salvaging, physical verification, standardisation etc.

It is submitted by the employer that the strength of the handling mazdoor should be determined and fixed afresh in all the three depots with due regards to the work, done by a handling gang, which should consist of one gang-sardar, one mandal and twentyone handling mazdoor. The strength of a gang is said to be such as required actually and the employer gives the nature of duties performed by the mazdoors stage by stage, for carrying out the whole operation of loading and unloading in six steps or stages. It is also stated that the workmen employed as munshis are redundant to the requirement as after departmentalisation their duties are being performed by the staff itself.

The first step of the operation requiring 4 persons, is to drag the bags from wagons/trucks for unloading and assist the next group to take up the loads, on head/back.

The next step requiring 4 persons, do the job of carrying the bags to weighment point.

At the next step the weighman that is the mandal, reads the weight, while 4 mazdoors place the bags on the weighment scale and then remove the bags and assist the next group of 6 persons for carrying the bags to the place of stacking inside the godown.

The next stage that is the fourth stage is to carry the bags to the place of stacking and as stated before as many as 6 persons are required to do this job, on account of the longer distance of lead involved, in such operation.

The fifth stage, needs two persons who work near the stack to arrange the bags and thus fill up blocks.

The sixth stage of work, for completion of the operation requires one person over the stack for proper placement of the bags on the stacking.

Besides, for co-ordination and supervision of the team work, one gang sardar is also required.

Thus in all 23 workmen including one mandal, one gang sardar and 21 mazdoors, take part in performance of the duties in a team spirit and, therefore, the manpower or strength required in each depot should be determined and fixed up, on such basis of calculation, of the total number of teams.

Similar is the reverse process, that is, for the issue and supply of foodgrain bags to State Government, P. P. Shops, flour millers and other agencies. The receipt and issue side constitute nearly 90 per cent of the handling operational work and there are other occasional handling operational work, such, as, standardisation, physical verification, rebagging etc. and these would be done by the handling gangs as and when necessary.

The gang sardar actually works as the leader of a group or team and thus his duty is to co-ordinate and supervise the work, in all the different stages of operations.

The weighman's duty is such that he is responsible for weighing the bags i.e., to call accurate weights for recording and ensure proper maintenance of the weights and in the event, of any defect in weight having detected, report about it to the godown-in-charge.

The duties of the handling mazdoor who undergo the strain of physical labour at all stages, start from unloading of bags and continues in carrying the gunny bags, piling up of bags and unload the bags.

The ancillary mazdoor performs miscellaneous work in the Food Storage depots including sweeping of foodgrains, opening and closing godown shutters, maintenance of godowns, erection of fences, road repairs and building repairs etc.

It is expected that the handling mazdoor should deal with an average of 90 bags in a shift of 8 hours and in case of any doubt the quantum of workload, should be determined if necessary scientifically by time and motion study by experts of the National Productivity Council and the objection to such examinations through expert advice unnecessarily raised by the Union cannot be entertained.

The Corporation, used to pay the contractors, under whom the workmen were employed, before at a rate of 39 per cent, 95 per cent, and 31 per cent above the scheduled rates, at Jamsedpur, Gaya and Mokmah depots respectively prior to 1-5-71. Evidently the contractors were satisfied with the adequacy of such payment and naturally they must have earned profits after meeting all expenses, including wages.

It is submitted that the job being piecercated, wage structure should be framed accordingly.

The Corporation in annexure 'A' has given the wage structure of handling mazdoor or workmen of similar category, employed in the Rice, Dal and Flour Mills of Bihar and also in, State Warehousing Corporation's godown, Sugar factories and Central Warehousing Corporation godowns at Bihar and asserts that the wages of the workmen involved in this dispute requires no change, when compared with the wage structure in those undertakings in Bihar. Besides, the cost of handling per M. T. of foodgrains, had increased considerably, such that it was 62 paise in 1970-71, Rs. 8.84 in 1971-72 and Rs. 5.60 in 1972-73 at Mokmah depot, and then Rs. .98 paise in 1970-71, Rs. 4.10 in 1971-72 and Rs. 3.15 in 1972-73 in Gaya depot and then .54, Re. 1.56, Re. 1.05 respectively in those years at Jamsedpur depot.

The Corporation, in order to substantiate its contention submitted charts in Annexure 'B' and annexure 'C' showing in these charts volume of operation, cost of handling per M.T., individual workload and requirement of workers on the norm of work at 90 bags per shift in these depots and charts as to the cost of handling per M.T. in other depots in Bihar.

The Corporation suggest distinct piece rated wages for different nature of work, fixing such rate, upon a standard at 100 bags (each weighing between 65 and 100 kgs.) with stacking upto 14 high and lead upto 66 feet. Thus distinct piece rates are suggested for (1) unloading and stacking in godown at Rs. 5/52, (2) unloading and loading direct on trucks at Rs. 3/56, (3) destacking from godown and loading in vehicles at Rs. 3/56, (4) unloading at godown siding and stacking in shed, platform or ground at Rs. 3.37, (5) weighing at Rs. 5/34, (6) physical verification at Rs. 7/98, (7) filling gunny bags with stitching and stacking or loading or delivery at Rs. 8/90 or Rs. 11/12 (when work of stacking would be involved), (8) standardisation at Rs. 10.67, (9) unloading of bulk foodgrains from wagons etc., filling gunnies and stacking or loading or delivery at Rs. 14/24 or Rs. 17/80 (when work of stacking would be involved), (10) Salvaging of damaged foodgrains at Rs. 19/63, (11) rebagging at Rs. 10.67 and (12) Breaking of stacking and restacking at Rs. 4.45.

Regarding the wage structure of ancillary mazdoor, the contention of the Corporation is that those workmen should get basic wages at Rs. 2.10 and dearness allowance at Rs. 2/40 making Rs. 4/50 per day in place of Rs. 125 per month as now prevailing.

On the question of incentive wages, which might be paid to handling mazdoor, the Corporation suggests a scheme as stated in para 13(b) of the statement. The norm is fixed at 90 bags stacking height at 14 bags and lead distance at 66 feet and it is contended that incentive can be earned at varying percentage when work performed goes above such norm.

In regards to sadar and mandal the proposal is to give them incentive wages at a flat rate of Re. 1 and Re. 0.50 per day respectively.

The Corporation meets the claim as to quantum of fall back wages of handling mazdoor, which relates to issue No. 2(b) in the order of reference, suggesting that the wages should be taken at Rs. 6 per day consisting of Rs. 3.60 as basic wage and Rs. 2.40 as dearness and that workmen would be paid for 16 days inclusive of 4/5 days as might be the weekly paid holiday, subject to the condition that in the event of unauthorised absence during a week, the workman will not be entitled to any wage for the weekly day of rest.

It stated that for the entitlement to fallback wages, the following conditions must be safeguarded:

- (1) that the management failed to provide work;
- (2) that the minimum guaranteed fall-back wages shall be proportionately reduced, in the event of unauthorised absence and leave;
- (3) that the mazdoor must have reported for duty of the schedule time and place.

For the rest of 14 days in a month wages would be paid on the basis of actual volume of work done or lay off wages in terms of Section 25(c) read with Section 2 Sub-clause (XXX) of the Industrial Dispute Act at 50 per cent of the total wages.

In the event of lack of work, however, the management must give at least one day notice and the workman would get attendance allowance at Re. 1.50 daily, without coming to the place of work. Similarly payment of wages as fall-back wages would be made to ancillary worker on the same principle, as stated before, at the rate of Rs. 4.50 per day, in place of Rs. 6 per day as in the case of handling mazdoor.

Regarding the fringe benefits to be given to the workmen, the Corporation's proposal is as follows :—

- (1) Leave
  - (a) Annual leave with wages—same as provided in Chapter IV of Bihar shops and Establishment Act of 1950.
  - (b) Sick/casual leave—7 days in a calendar year.
  - (c) Weekly holiday with wages.
  - (d) Paid holidays—6 days in calendar year including 26th January and 2nd October.
- (2) Medical aid.

The Corporation would establish dispensaries, provided with doctors and compounders, for outdoor medical facilities to the handling/ancillary mazdoor.

Besides, the workman would be granted special leave and ex-gratia allowance, in the event of sickness due to T.B., Leprosy, Cancer and insanity as per rules given in Annexure 'E'.

- (3) Children's educational allowance.

The workmen shall be entitled to such allowance, as per rules, stated in Annexure 'D'.

- (4) Travelling allowance.

Workmen would be paid train fare to their home town once in two years.

- (5) Annual Bonus.

Workmen would be paid bonus according to the provisions in the Bonus Act, 1965.

- (6) Contributory provident Fund.



Workmen would get the benefit on the basis of contribution at 8 per cent of wages

#### (7) Gratuity

Workmen would be paid according to statutory provisions

The Corporation has given in paragraph 16 of the statement, a calculation about the strength of the workmen needed in the three depots at Mokameh Gaya and Jamsedpur and has thereby claimed that only 147 workmen are needed at Mokameh and 153 workmen are surplus 97 at Gaya and 153 are surplus to the requirement and 61 workmen at Jamsedpur and 29 are surplus to the requirement

The calculation as to required strength of workman in the three depots is based on capacity of the depots average volume of operation in each depot daily and upon taking as norm of capacity at 90 bags per worker per shift and 5 workers for every 5000 mt capacity for performing the miscellaneous work, assigned to ancillary workman, and adding 27 per cent more, as leave reserve, weekly off and other occasional operational difficulties. A chart in annexure 'B' is given to substantiate and indicate the average daily operation in each depot in 1970-71 and 1971-72. The concept of departmentalisation according to the views of the Corporation means a closed register so that the available work spread over the minimum number of workmen and that would enable them to increase their wages through the medium of incentive wages. In short, the number of mazdoors in each depots should be cut down and reduced

It is contended that the awards made in respect to workmen employed at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras should have no application in determining the wage structure and other fringe benefits so far as these workmen employed in the depots of FCI in Bihar are concerned, and that the demand made by the Union, are not fair, legal and proper

After both the parties filed the statement, making over their respective contentions they prayed for opportunities being given to go through the statements and submit replies in the shape of rejoinders and the prayer being allowed for ends of justice they filed rejoinders in due course

I now proceed to deal with the assertions made in the rejoinder filed by the Union, first

It is stated that the Union started its legitimate agitation for the abolition of the contract labour system as far back as in 1968 and not at the time as stated by the FCI in para 2 of their statement and as a consequence the contract labour system was abolished in West Bengal in 1969 and the agreement for departmentalisation was made effective in Bihar in May, 1971. It is asserted that the departmentalisation was a final and irrevocable measure and not a temporary ad hoc measure as should be made out in paras 3, 4 and 5 of the statement of the employer

The Union denies the allegation as to existence of and surplus labour strength and also denies that the Union did not extent its co-operation to resolve all disputes concerning the workmen. It is stated that there are 20 munshis employed in the three depots and they generally assist the sardars in their duties and can never be said to be redundant to the requirement as stated in paragraph 10(c) of the statement. Besides, the calculation of manpower required to perform different nature of work, as distributed in six steps or stages as given nature of work, as distributed in six steps or stages, as given in para 10 is materially incorrect. The strength of a gang in Calcutta consists of one sardar one mandal and 12 handling labour. The issue and receipt sides are clearly demarcated and operation in these cannot be shown together. The so called job descriptions of the workmen in different stages as given by the employer is also misleading. If the receipt and issue side be considered separately as had been accepted by the FCI in previous negotiations the strength in each side should be one sardar, one mandal and 12 handling mazdoor which is the existing position accepted in West Bengal and that is no reason for making variation in respect to workmen engaged at these three depots. There is also no necessity for calculation of manpower by any expert agency when the yardstick is already determined in West Bengal. Besides for performing the usual normal duties as to salvaging, physical verification and rebagging, extra hands

are employed, and such employment of extra hands is necessary, over and above the strength of workmen as stated before

The Union reasserts that contract labour system was harmful, as it encouraged exploitation of labour and that is why it had to be abolished. Moreover, the handling cost had appreciably gone down after abolition of the contract labour system. It is stated once again that the nature of work being similar, the West Bengal system of wages and conditions of service should be made available to Bihar workers

The Union, denies the suggestions put forward by FCI in para 13 of their statement and alleges it to be fantastic to suggest that while handling 9 bags 10 per cent of the earning is paid, that only 10 per cent of the extra earning would be derived by handling 20 bags, more, for the purpose of calculating incentive wages. The Union in their reply does not admit any of the statements in paras 14, 15 and 16 of the FCI's statement. They stick to their contentions, and demands as to fallback wages and fringe benefit being such as already enumerated in Annexure 'B' of their statement

Besides, it is contended that there is need for more than 640 workers in the three depots and the retrenchment of 308 workers, at the time of departmentalisation was an unilateral decision of the management, to which the Union never agreed

The wages paid to some workmen in Bihar as shown in annexures 'A', 'B' and of the employer's statement is not admitted and it is contended that such wage structure is wholly irrelevant and the Government as an ideal employer must remove all uncalled for discrimination in respect to their workers employed in Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, West Bengal and Bihar

I now state in brief the submission of FCI in their rejoinder in reply to the Union's statement

It is submitted that the Corporation is an autonomous body set up by the Parliament, by the Food Corporation of India Act which received assent of the Parliament on December 10 1964 and so it is not a successor in authority in regards to the activities done earlier by the Regional Director of Food and the State Government

The Corporation had a storage capacity of 22.93 lakh tonnes at its inception which was transferred to the Central Depot of Food. The storage capacity became 79.52 lakhs tonnes on September 1, 1973 which included spaces owned and hired by the Corporation

It is further contended that there are other Unions of workmen namely, "Bharataya Khadya Nigam Mazdoor Panchayet, Dhanbad", "Commercial Mazdoor Panchayet, Muzafferpur" District FCI Palleter, Durbhanga' union working in Bihar and also "Kamrup Industrial Workers' Union" in Assam claiming to be representing the workmen engaged in the food storage depots and so this Union is not the only representative of the workmen

It is contended that the responsibility for general superintendence and management of the Corporation and the workmen is vest under the Act in the Board of Directors exercising all such powers and perform all such acts and things as may be exercised or performed by the Corporation and for that the Board performs its duties having due regards to the interest of producers and consumers guided by instructions of policy given by the Central Government

The Corporation had no idea about the number of permanent or temporary workers, employed by the contractors and, as such, the statement of the Union in paragraph 6, is extraneous to the issues referred to this arbitration. The Corporation took the policy of abolishing the contract labour system in phases and make available to the workmen just and fair terms of employment, keeping in view the terms and conditions of service in respect to workmen, doing similar nature of work in other concerns in Bihar. Besides, the provisions of the Bihar Shops and Employment Act 1950 is applicable to all workmen, in all Food Supply Depots under the Corporation in Bihar

With regard to the statement in paragraph 8, the Corporation asserts that the Manager of the Patna office, had no authority to decide finally about the terms and conditions of service of the handling/ancillary mazdoor and he could not decide such a major policy matter, involving the terms and conditions of service of workmen, without taking prior approval from top management. The management agreed to the demand for departmentalisation under the pressure of the Union in the unusual circumstances prevailing in 1970-71, as arising from the influx of about one crore refugees from East Bengal. It was at the insistence of the then Labour Minister of Bihar that Shri B. K. Singh who was the Regional Manager had to make some involuntary concessions as stated in the telex dated 26-6-1971 which the Union referred to in Annexure 'A' of their statement. In fact the management had always mentioned that the terms and conditions of employment of their workmen would be finalised subsequently with due regards to the conditions of labour engaged in similar and comparable units in Bihar. This can be gathered from the subsequent turn of event, as expressed in the letter of Shri B. K. Singh to Shri Narayan dated 17-6-1971 marked annexure 'A'. Besides, the minutes of the meeting between the management and the Union held on 30-6-1971, which is marked annexure 'B' to the statement would support the contention.

The management denies the statement in paragraph 9 of the Union's statement that the terms and conditions of service of the workmen under F.C.I. is uniform throughout India and the discrimination had been made in respect to the workmen in Gaya, Mokameh and Jamsedpur depots. In fact, the decision as to departmentalisation had been taken first in regards to the workmen at Manmad, in the Western region and the wage structure prevailing there would establish the contention of the management.

In reply to the Union's assertion in paragraph 10 of the statement, the management has submitted that the Regional Manager, being fully aware of his position that he could not have a final say in the matter first agreed on March 23, 1973 to refer the controversy regarding wage structure etc. to the Zonal Manager, Head Office, provided the Union agreed as to fixation of strength according to handling norms decided in the head office and also to the transfer of workmen and the minutes of that discussion as given in annexure 'C' would support that. Thereafter, the matter of the dispute could not be decided, due to the unreasonable and adamant attitude of the Union.

It is asserted that the handling or ancillary mazdoor are required to work for 8 hours a day and any assertion to the contrary, as made in para 16 of the Union's statement is wrong and that job description of the workmen, as already given in details is true and correct.

Similarly, the scheme for incentive wages as already stated in para 13(b) is reasonable and any suggestion to the contrary as made in para 17 of the Union's statement, cannot be accepted.

The Management also denies the statements in paras 18, 19 and 20 of the Union's statement. In answer to the contention of the Union in paragraph 21 of their statement, it is submitted that the F.C.I. never procured wheat in the Patna Division and there is no question of taking over entirely the wheat trade. Besides, the F.C.I. procured only 430.6 MT. of wheat on Tihut Division, against the estimated target of 4 lakh tonnes in Bihar by the F.C.I. Moreover, the volume of operation went down due to fall in production in the Punjab, Haryana, U.P. and Rajasthan and the State Government after formation of Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Department has taken upon a programme of handling a major portion of operation in food-grains through the State organisation and so the volume of work at the Gaya, Mokameh and Jamsedpur depots got considerably affected. So in order to ensure adequate earning of piecerated workers the required strength should be limited, as otherwise the pressure of surplus labour force, would affect the average earning of the handling/ancillary mazdoors.

The management also denies and challenges the claim, as to fallback wages, in respect to the workmen, in comparison to those in force in Calcutta, as made in paragraph 22 of the Union's statement. This is in short the reply of the

management in answer to the Union's demands in respect to the issues referred to arbitration

After the statements and replies had been filed, the parties filed their documents and gave copies thereto to each other.

Some documents which includes some letters and correspondences had been produced at a late stage and proved in course of examination of some witnesses by the employer. The Union took exception to production of such documents as no prior notice had been given about the nature and contents of the same and for which the Union had been taken by surprise.

In course of hearing, the workmen examined two witnesses and the employer examined ten witnesses.

The reference to arbitration at the consent and agreement between the parties relates to consideration and decision of the following points:—

1. (a) What should be the workload of an individual handling mazdoors/gang and munshis and ancillary mazdoor/in a shift of eight hours at the P. S. depots, Gaya, Mokameh and Jamsedpur.
- (b) What should be the incentive scheme of sardars, munshis, mandals and handling mazdoors
2. (a) What would be the wage structure of departmentalised workers in Bihar depots.
- (b) Fallback wages in a month and the conditions for entitlement in respect of piecerated handling mazdoors viz., mazdoors, mandals/weighman, and gang sardar and munshis and ancillary workers.
3. What should be fringe benefits of the aforesaid workers.
4. What should be the strength of the handling mazdoors at the aforesaid depots having regard to the workload and the average operational requirement there.

Apparently the dispute between the Food Corporation of India that is the employer and the workmen is confined to the workmen going by the name of handling mazdoors employed at the F.C.I. depots situated at Gaya, Mokameh and Jamsedpur all situated in the State of Bihar.

The Food Corporation of India as an autonomous body was set up by an Act of the Parliament i.e., the Food Corporation of India Act which came into force on December 10, 1964, and the Corporation carries on its business in procurement, storage and distribution of food grains throughout the entire country.

The Corporation carries for its functioning dividing its activities for convenience in administration through four zonal offices having a zonal manager, at the top of the zones known as the east, west, north and south zones. Of these four regions as stated before, the eastern zone with which we are concerned in the present dispute comprises of West Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Assam, Tripura, Nagaland, Meghalaya, Arunachal. According to the Union, there are about 20,000 workmen employed in the several depots, distributed at various places within each State and territory in these four zones.

The task of handling of food grains, received at different places comprises of loading and unloading of food grains despatched in gunny bags in wagons or trucks, weighing of the food grains, stacking properly the food grain bags in the godowns, counting of the stacks, rebagging of bags as and when necessary, salvaging, physical verification, standardisation and then again unloading of bags from godown to grain shops for despatch. These are the essential duties performed by the handling mazdoors working in a team spirit dividing themselves in gangs at their respective places of operation. The mazdoors concerned in the dispute are so named and categorised as mandal, sardar or gang sardar, munshis, handling mazdoor and ancillary mazdoor and it appears that they work for eight hours a

day, which is the period of a shift, including a rest period of one hour

The mazdoors had been previously employed by private contractors as selected and appointed by the FCI and the wages and other conditions of service of the labour force were controlled and regulated by the contractors

The Union wanted abolition of the contract labour system as they felt that the workmen were being exploited and, as such, the Union carried on their activities and negotiations with the Corporation for departmentalisation of the mazdoors, so that the workmen might get the status of being direct employees under the Food Corporation of India, and the terms and conditions of service of the mazdoors stabilised. Needless to mention that workmen working under contractors, who received payment from the FCI were discontented as there was obviously no security of service prescribed terms and conditions of employment, uncertain wage condition and practically no amenity as to fringe benefits in the shape of leave, holidays, retiring benefit, medical benefit etc which are the essential requirement of every employee rendering service, in return of wages

The employer in the written statement asserted that the contractors were paid at a rate at 39 per cent 95 per cent and 31 per cent above certain scheduled rates for each type of work and the contractors must have earned profits after meeting all expenses including wages to the workmen and that the workmen cannot claim introduction of conditions of service, as to wage structure and other benefits which would increase the handling cost per unit of foodgrain to an exorbitant extent

Be that as it is, there is no dispute on the point that the workmen that is the handling mazdoors, sardars, munshis, ancillary mazdoors working in the depots in Calcutta and other parts of West Bengal were all departmentalised on 15-1-70. But then the FCI did not departmentalise the workmen in the Bihar region, or to be precise at Gaya, Mokemah and Jamsedpur and, therefore, the agitation of the Union to abolish the contract labour system at such places, continued to achieve departmentalisation

It is stated by the Union that the legitimate agitation on their part to abolish contract labour system in these three depots started as far back as in 1968 and not just before 1970-1971 as stated by the employer in their statement

It is not, however, material for the purpose of this proceeding to trace out how and when the Union initiated their agitation for abolition of the contract labour system, as prevailing in the depots of FCI at Gaya, Mokemah and Jamsedpur. It matters little, if the move for such abolition originated in 1968 or in 1969

The admitted position, however, is that 640 workmen had been departmentalised by the Regional Manager of Patna at these three depots with effect from 15-7-71. Actually out of these 640 departmentalised workmen the distribution was such that the number departmentalised was fixed 300 at Mokemah 250 at Gaya and 90 at Jamsedpur

It is contended by the employer that the number and strength of the handling mazdoors who were departmentalised was fixed on an ad hoc basis and the strength of such workmen should be re-determined and fixed afresh with due regards to the work done by them, working in several gangs in each of the depots so that the surplus hands might be diverted in other food corporation storage depots in the Bihar region. It is further contended that the workload of the mazdoors, per shift of eight hours should be determined and the actual requirement in each depot should be thus ascertained. In short the submission of the employer is that the strength of the mazdoors, as departmentalised is in excess of the actual requirement, if a scientific basis for determination of workload of the individual mazdoor be adopted for calculation of the required number of mazdoors. It is asserted by the employer in para 16 of the statement that the FCI requires only 305 workmen in the three depots and as such the rest of the workmen are now surplus to the requirement. On the other hand, the contention of the Union is that at the time of departmentalisation as many as 948 workmen were working in these depots under the contractors and of them only 640 had been departmentalised eliminating the rest even though the requirement was much more than 640. It is submitted

that issue No. 4 relating to determination of the strength of mazdoors had been included, at the insistence of the employer and is otherwise mischievous and uncalled for and mala-fide

It can at once be said that issues 1(a) and 4 are interconnected. On the other hand the other issues that is issues 1(b), 2(a), 2(b) and 3, which are concerning incentive, wages, wage structure, fallback wages and fringe benefits are inter connected in the sense that these relate to improvement of the existing conditions of employment of the workmen in respect to these issues the demand of the Union in substance is that the workmen should be given the same terms and conditions in wages and fringe benefit as enjoyed by the mazdoors working in Calcutta and West Bengal, in the depots of the Food Corporation of India and there is no justification for such discrimination between workman and workman, working under the same employer within the same zone, when they are doing the same nature of work

So even though the question of burden of proof is not so material after both parties have adduced evidence and that the law of burden of proof, cannot be strictly applied in deciding labour disputes particularly in an arbitration proceedings which is a quasi-judicial proceeding, it should be taken into account, that while the employer asserts that the strength of the mazdoors, now in employment is in excess of requirement, from the standpoint of volume of work and workload, when the workmen challenge that, the workmen claim improvement in wage structure, pay packet and fringe benefits which are opposed by the employer. Mr. Dutt has rightly relied on the cited (1) Management of Western India Match Co. and the Tribunal (Insurance Factories and Labour Land Report 1962 Vol IV, page 60) wherein it was held that the Evidence Act does not strictly apply even to a proceeding before the Industrial Tribunal

As already stated the employer i.e., FCI had departmentalised 640 workmen since 15-1-71 and such number of workmen are still employed in three depots. The case of the employer is that it was just an ad hoc settlement in the abnormal circumstances then prevailing and actually such number of workmen was in excess of actual requirement as it was in 1971. It will, however, be pertinent to remember that the workmen in West Bengal had been departmentalised long before i.e. on 15-1-70. There is no material to indicate on what basis in any as to workload per mazdoor, the total volume of work, the capacity of godowns, the number of mazdoors, to be departmentalised had been ascertained by the zonal office of FCI in West Bengal, functioning from Calcutta. Shri Asoke Ghose, the first witness examined by the Union stated that a decision to departmentalise 640 workmen had been taken in a bipartite agreement between the Union leaders and the Regional Manager of FCI at Patna and the Regional Manager Shri B. K. Singh, IAS confirmed the same in a telex message dated 26-6-71. Ex 1 is the said telex message which is marked as a 'mission'. It appears from Ex 1 that it was sent by Singh to Shri R. D. Narayan, the Zonal Manager at Calcutta with copy to the Manager at the Head Office at Delhi. It also appears from the contents of Ex 1 that some labour leaders headed by one Ashim Mukherjee met Singh in his chamber and out of a list of 948 workmen it had been agreed between the parties to departmentalise 640 after a good deal of negotiations and that the rest 308 labours were agreed to be put in a reserve pool and shifted elsewhere. It was further agreed that the departmentalised workmen would get the same benefits as to terms and conditions of service as applicable to the workmen already departmentalised in Calcutta. Shri Ghose stated that the Regional Manager had authority to decide about complement of labour on departmentalisation and that he himself took part along with other Union leaders in the aforesaid negotiations with Shri Singh. The Union then came to know about the decision on 26-6-71 when the telex 1 was sent. That 640 workmen would be departmentalised with effect from 15-7-71 and 308 labours would be in the reserve list is also contained in the Memorandum, Ex 10 dated 9-7-71, showing the decision taken by S. Narayan, the Deputy Financial Adviser and P. S. Rao, the Deputy Zonal Manager in consultation with the Financial Adviser. So virtually the decision to departmentalise 640 workers and retaining 308 workmen in the reserve list was arrived at by the Zonal Manager in a meeting held in Calcutta. The Union of course did not agree to the proposed wage structure of such departmentalised

workmen as mentioned in Ex. 10. The minutes of the proceeding in the meeting between the Union and the management held on 11-8-71 shows that no final settlement as to wage structure of these 640 workmen had been made in spite of the agreement as per Ex. 1 and that only a particular rates or wages for the workmen as a measure of ad hoc payment was agreed to, between the parties [vide Ex. 1 (c)]. I shall consider about the wage structure while considering that issue.

The employers examined as their first witness Jamaluddin, the Senior Assistant Manager (Labour) posted at the Regional Office at Patna from the month of February, 1972 to January 9th, 1974. He stated that he learnt from the Regional Manager B. K. Singh that he had departmentalised 640 workmen, under very abnormal circumstances. He stated that he had not seen any paper or record in the office on what basis B. K. Singh departmentalised exactly 640 workmen. He is an important witness on the point that the statements of the employer had been filed, after due consultation with him, as being conversant with all relevant facts connected with this dispute. But he has no direct knowledge as to how the strength of the departmentalised workmen, had been agreed to be just 640 and he cannot give any basis of calculation, either on an estimate of workload or otherwise as to how such specific number had been agreed to by the management and the Union. It is just stated that he learnt from Singh that it was done under abnormal circumstances. In para 2 of the written statement by the employer it was stated that the Corporation was hard pressed to share responsibility in dealing with relief measure for the refugees from East Bengal and this was the abnormal situation. I do not quite appreciate if this at all created such an abnormal situation for the F.C.I. particularly when there is no evidence on the point. It is, however, to be noted that the Union, in their rejoinder denied the statement and asserted that the decision to departmentalise 640 workmen was final and irrevocable. In para 9 of the rejoinder the employer stated that it was because of the intervention and persistence of the Labour Minister, Bihar that Sri Singh had to make involuntary concession, as contained in the telex, Ex. 1 dated 26-6-1971. There is, however, no dependable evidence as to the nature of such intervention of the Labour Minister. Shri Sinha, the Regional Manager, could not produce any letter written to his superior office of the Corporation, either at Delhi, the head office or at Calcutta, the Zonal office, that he made such involuntary concession, at the intervention of the Labour Minister. Sinha in his evidence stated that he had made series of discussions with the Union leaders before 26-6-1971 and he also had enough of discussions with the Zonal Manager in Calcutta and the Managing Director at Delhi. But he candidly stated that right from the beginning he was opposed to the idea of departmentalisation. In support of his statement Singh proved extract copy of the letter dated 3-3-1971 sent by him to the Managing Director with copies to Zonal Manager, Calcutta and others (vide Ex. 0). It was stated in that letter that the State Government that is Bihar Government and the Regional Manager had a right to be consulted before a policy as to departmentalisation was taken and such decision could not be taken unilaterally by the Zonal office, in Calcutta. Singh admitted in his cross-examination that Mr. Roy, as referred to in Ex. 0 means the Deputy Zonal Officer, and he was his superior officer. The employer produced and proved through Singh the letter (copy) dated 15-3-1971 which was sent by A. K. Dutta, I.A.S., Chief Commercial Manager to Singh [vide Ex. 0(1)] in reply. This letter fully explains that the management at the top at New Delhi including the Managing Director had agreed to departmentalise the workers as far back as in October, 1970.

Extracts from Ex. 0(1) are as follows :—

"Contrary to what you seem to think, the agreement to departmentalise such workers in Bihar depots was certainly not 'unilateral'. This agreement was reached after F.C.I. workers' union representatives met the Management (including the Manager, Director) at New Delhi in October, 1970 and several times, at the Zonal level in Calcutta in October/November, 1970.

We can possibly defer departmentalisation by a few weeks/months on the plea that the incentive scheme has not been

properly implemented in Calcutta area. But certainly we cannot defer such departmentalisation indefinitely. If we do so, the Regional Labour Commissioner is also likely to question our bona fides.

I am afraid you have to reconcile yourself to the idea of decentralisation of workmen on F.C.I. depots."

The contents of Ex. 0(1) clearly indicates that the Head Office and the Zonal Office of F.C.I. had been asking the Regional Manager to departmentalise the mazdoors as it had been agreed to after negotiations with the Union representatives at the topmost level. Solomon Minj who was the Deputy Regional Manager, Bihar in May, 1971 and is the present Regional Manager stated that the Regional Manager had no power to departmentalise workers, and that he had no power to fix the strength of the mazdoors, on departmentalisation. There is, however, clear evidence that Regional Manager was being asked and ultimately authorised by the Head Office to departmentalise the workers. Besides, there is no evidence, to indicate that a Regional Manager had no authority either to departmentalise mazdoor or to fix the number of such mazdoor. A printed booklet under a title 'Delegation of powers of various authorities in F.C.I.' had been filed by the employer (vide Ex. N). But Mr. Dutt in course of his argument did not refer to any provision of it, to indicate that the Regional Manager at the relevant time had no authority to fix the number of mazdoors on departmentalisation. I have gone through the booklet and fail to find any provision in it to that effect. Solomon Minj stated that there is a circular defining the powers of the Regional Manager. But no such circular is produced by the employer. The employer's side relied upon the telex message Ex. 1, dated 30-6-1961 proved by Solomon Minj, sent by Gurbaksh Singh, the then Joint Manager (Storage), F.C.I., New Delhi to B. K. Singh wherein it was stated that the Head Office was surprised at his agreeing to departmentalise 640 workers and to extend to the departmentalised workmen the same service conditions as those in Calcutta. But it nowhere speaks that the Regional Manager, exceeded his power or acted against the wishes of the top officers when he agreed to departmentalise 640 workmen and agreed to extend to them the same conditions of service, as those in Calcutta.

The employer produced a copy of the minutes of discussion B. K. Sinha had with the Union leaders on 30-6-1971 (vide Ex. M). It is stated therein that the Union leaders wanted departmentalisation of 308 workers, over and above those 640 already departmentalised and Singh took the stand that in case of departmentalisation in other depots, the case of these 308 workers would be considered and that he could not take a single man more than 640 as this was also much on the highside, as even during peak period the F.C.I. did not require more than 425 hands. The telex Ex. 1 also shows that 308 workmen had been put in the Reserve pool. There is thus no denying that after a great deal of negotiations as stated in Ex. 1, Singh agreed departmentalise 640 workers. Singh stated that he had series of discussions with the Zonal Manager and the Managing Director before departmentalisation. Of course I get no evidence to find out as to the nature and trend of such discussions as neither the Zonal Manager nor any officer from the Zonal office or head office is examined. K. D. Narayan, the then Zonal Manager, though summoned was not examined. Sinha just stated that he agreed to departmentalise 640 workmen, as mentioned in Ex. 1, on being compelled to do so as being pressed by the Labour Minister of Bihar. A similar contention was made in the rejoinder. But he admits that he did not write to the superior officers of F.C.I. that he was being so compelled by the Minister, but he simply stated that he explained that verbally.

Now K. D. Narayan was the Zonal Manager in Calcutta at the relevant time. He has since retired and was cited as a witness in the list of witnesses submitted by the employer and summoned through me. He actually came down to Calcutta on being summoned. But curiously enough the employer did not examine him. Mr. D. L. Sen Gupta, Advocate representing the Union, filed a petition on 9-7-1974 (vide or. n. 28) that Narayan be tendered for examination so that he might avail of the opportunity to cross-examine him. But Narayan was not examined. It is of course the

liberty of the party to choose, what witnesses would be examined, but when Narayan was not examined, I am left with no corroborative oral evidence that Singh verbally told him that he had departmentalised 640 workmen, on being compelled to do so by the Labour Minister, Bihar or that he acted without discussion with Narayan, the Zonal Head. The employer provided a copy of a letter dated 2-12-1971, which Singh wrote to Gurbaksh Singh explaining in some details as to how 640 workmen had been departmentalised and why he agreed to extend the same terms and conditions of service to the Bihar workmen, as prevailing in West Bengal (vide Ex. 50). In that letter it was mentioned that the Labour Minister told him that no compromise could take place in the management and the employees took a rigid stand. Obviously, I do not see in such statement about any pressure being put on Singh by the Minister. That Singh was against departmentalisation, is apparent from his evidence, even though the Head Office instructed him not delay any further departmentalisation of workers and to reconcile himself to that [vide Ex. 5(1)]. It is also apparent from the contents of Ex. 5(6) that the list of workmen as submitted by the own staff of the F.C.I. was nearly 1200 and, therefore, the Union, which was pressing for departmentalisation of 948, just got a ground to tell the Minister that the list of workmen as given by them was a correct list. Thus, it was explained by B. K. Singh, that after a good deal of negotiations he agreed to accept for departmentalisation 640 hands even though such number was in excess of requirement in his estimate. It appears from the contents of Ex. 5(5) and 5(6), that the State Government of Bihar was not expressing any opinion, on the question of departmentalisation. Besides, the Chief Commercial Manager, A. K. Dutta, I.A.S., in para 5 of his letter to Singh, Ex. 5(7) mentioned that the F.C.I. was the sole authority to determine its labour policy and the State Government was not required to be consulted at all. I find on consideration of the evidence that Singh, agreed to departmentalise 640 workmen after negotiations with the Union and that it was a voluntary agreement between Singh and the Union and that Singh, as the Regional Manager, had consulted the Zonal Manager and the Head Office before-hand and that he had not only the authority but directed to departmentalise the workmen without delay. The Labour Minister had not put any pressure upon Singh at least in the matter of fixing up the number of hands at 640 who were departmentalised. She just advised him to meet the labour leaders. Even then it is necessary to consider the question of the required labour strength definitely. B. K. Singh was against departmentalisation and Mr. Sen Gupta, closed his cross-examination with a suggestion to him that he was against trade unionism.

It is the case of the employer that the strength of the mazdoor need be redetermined on the basis of normal workload, per mazdoor. Jamaluddin, who is the main witness of the employer stated that it was generally agreed that the per capita workload of a handling mazdoor would be 90 bags per day per shift. Admittedly the mazdoors work in a gang. In the long written statement of the employer, the nature and variety of work done by the gang sardar, weighman, handling mazdoor and ancillary mazdoors is given in paragraph 10 at page 5 after description of the operation in six stages of starting from unloading of bags from wagon/trucks to placement on stacking at the godown in the receipt side. It is contended by the employer that each gang would consist of 21 handling mazdoor, one sardar and one mandal making in all 23, for performing the duties in six stages in the receipt side. It is stated in para 9(h) that in the reverse process that is for issue of food grains to shops, State Government, Flour millers, handling operation by mazdoors are carried on similarly. But no details of the stages of operation in the issue side had been furnished to determine the necessary strength of the labour force, at these three depots for performing duties in the two sides. The employer sent a draft proposal in April 1972 as to wage structure and fringe benefits which they wanted to extend to the workmen and at that document the strength of a gang had been stated to be 14 and not 23 as now suggested (vide Ex. H).

In the letter of Malay Ghose, Deputy Manager (Labour), for the Zonal Manager, addressed to the Union dated 17-12-1973, the strength of necessary labour force at Digha and five other depots in Bihar had been proposed to be 14 (vide Ex. 13). The break up of the total number shows that gang actually comprise of 14 mazdoors besides ancillary mazdoor whose number is about 25 per cent of the handling mazdoors though varying from place to place (vide Ex. 13).

The Union claims that the strength of a gang in Calcutta is 15, including a munshi. The employer in para 9(c) of the statement alleged that the staff of the depots is competent to do the work of munshi and so such category of workmen is redundant. But the fact remains that the munshis are in employment and they are willing to work as such there is no question of retrenchment of labour or replacement of them. Besides, in para 10(b) it is stated by the employer that the strength of a gang as at present varies from 15 to 39 and clearly the munshis are included in it. Ghanasyam Jana, the second witness of the Union states in cross-examination that it cannot be said as an uniform rule that one single gang would perform the duties both in the receipt and issue side and this happens only when the work is to be performed simultaneously. His evidence is that the stages of operation as stated by the employer in paragraph 10 is not correct and, in fact, the work of the gangs comprises of receipt, weighment and delivery or issue of bags making three district gangs. Be that as it is, the gang strength must be taken at 15 including munshi, and not at 23, as now stated by the employer. There is absolutely no consistency in the statement of the employer as to the required strength of labour force in the three depots. The volume of work both in receipt and issue side are variable and fluctuating in nature. B. K. Singh expressed a view that even during peak period they did not require more than 425 workmen (vide Ex. M dated 30-6-1971). It is not clearly explained how such number was calculated and arrived at. Apparently the strength of labour force in a gang is not 23 as stated in the written statement and deposed to by Jamaluddin particularly when operation in the issue side is not described at all and as a matter of fact work is being actually carried on through gang comprising of 15 to 39 hands even upto date. The employer as I stated before sent a draft proposal as to labour strength and wage structure in April 1972 but the Union did not accept the same (vide Ex. H). The calculation of labour strength was made on the basis of 90 bags per worker per day taking a gang strength at 14. The number of gangs was taken at 13 at Mokameh, 9 at Gaya and 5 at Jamsedpur making in all 27. So if a gang strength be taken at 15 and not at 14, as the munshis are not redundant, the number works out at 405. The number of ancillary mazdoor as needed was stated in Ex. H to be 72 at Mokameh, 28 at Gaya and 8 at Jamsedpur making in all 108. Thus the required labour strength comes to 513 and not 425 as stated in Ex. M. This is an apparent contradiction in the evidence of employer. Moreover, in para 16 of the written statement the employer stated that additional hands at 27 per cent should be kept for leave reserve, weekly off and other operational difficulties and gave a calculation on the basis of 27 per cent handling mazdoor and ancillary mazdoor. Thus the number of labours as additional hands come to 106 making in all 619, which is just slightly less than 640. There would be no difference if the sardars, mandals and munshis are taken into account in making provision of leave reserve at 27 per cent upon 513, a figure arrived on the basis of employer's own version, as contained in Ex. H. It is difficult, therefore, to hold that the strength fixed at 640 was in excess of actual requirement, at the time of departmentalisation.

According to the employer, the basis of calculation of required labour strength should be such that 90 bags can be handled by a mazdoor in a day. But this is not proper. Rather it makes an over simplification of the complicated problem by just prescribing a simple formula without taking into account all relevant factors. The nature of work of the handling mazdoor covers and includes various types of duties viz., unloading from wagons, weighment, physical verification, standardisation, salvaging, rebagging etc. as enumerated in 12(f) of the written statement of the employer. The norm as to workload is taken at 90 bags weighing between 66 kgs. and 95 kgs. each per mazdoor per shift for loading and unloading work, when the lead is 66 feet and lift or stacking is upto 8 bags. In fact, the incentive wages are calculated in West Bengal taking such norm with incentive for lead in excess of 66 feet and stacking above 8 bags high along with different rates for different types of work, treating workmen as piece rated workers. The incentive scheme introduced by the F.C.I., Eastern Zone, Calcutta dated 14-12-1970 in their godowns in greater Calcutta was revised by an arbitration award, given by Shri B. N. Banerjee, J., Judge, High Court, Calcutta which was duly published in accordance with law, as per order dated 17-8-1972. The copy of the award is marked Ex. 16 by me, at the consent of parties. In the result it follows that the norm

of workload for the handling mazdoor is different, for different variety of work and the norm of 90 bags is applicable in a restricted sense when the lead is by 66 feet and the lift is upto fixed height of 8 bags. The required strength of mazdoor can be determined only when a correct assessment of different variety of work done by the mazdoor in these depots in a year is determined. I am afraid the question thus remains unsolved, for want of materials and necessary data furnished by the employer. It is clear from the award of Shri Banerjee that the norm of workload was taken at 40 bags and not 90 bags, in the case of standardisation work. The rate for unloading from wagons and stacking in godown was taken at Rs. 4.42 and that for standardisation Rs. 10.90 and for salvaging of damaged foodgrains Rs. 19.63. This shows how the norm is different for different type of work.

The employer committed mistake in calculating the labour strength without taking into account the different variety of work required to be done in the several depots and apply a general overall flat rate of 90 bags as an all embracing norm.

Besides, Saifur Hossain, the Chief Labour Inspector of F.C.I. at Jamsedpur, examined by the employer did not support the employer's case that there were surplus hands at Jamsedpur depots when he stated in the examination in chief that he could not say that the numerical strength of labour working at Jamsedpur was on the higher side or on the lower side.

Debajyoti Basu, who is posted at Gaya depots as Assistant Grade II stated that in his opinion, the labour at Gaya depot is little more as compared to the capacity of the godown at 33,600 mt. But godown capacity has very little importance in determining the required labour strength and Ghanshyam Jana stated that at Jamsedpur depot the bags were found stacked upto a height of 14 or 12 bags and therefore, much exceeding 8 bags upon which godown capacity is fixed. Besides the incentive scheme, in Ex. 16, makes provision for stacking even beyond 17 bags. On my local inspection at Gaya depot, I found sugar bags at one place stacked 17 bags high.

The employer produced some charts showing therein the daily average of the number of bags handled at three depots in 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73. The chart which is in the nature of a compiled statement is said to have been prepared from some statements. Jamaluddin proved the chart which was marked Ex. G, subject to objection of Mr. Sen Gupta. The Union challenges the correctness of the statements in the chart, as the original records are not produced. O.P.W.(4) B. K. Kulvani is a signatory in Ex. G and he stated that the documents upon reference to which Ex. G was prepared are voluminous and so could not be produced. But he admits that monthly reports are kept in one file and so far as col. 3 is concerned, it may be one chart or 2 charts and may be more than 2 sheets of paper for each depot. So I cannot say that the original records which are not produced are either numerous or voluminous. Mr. Sen Gupta urged that an adverse inference under Section 114(g) of the Evidence Act should be drawn for non-production of original records. In support he relied on the decision reported in (2) A.I.R. 1968 Supreme Court at page 1413 (Gopal Krishnaji Ketkar v. Mohamed Haji Latif and others). It was held that it was not a sound practice for those desiring to rely upon a certain state of facts to withhold from the Court the best evidence which was in their possession which would throw light upon the issues in controversy and to rely upon the abstract doctrine of onus of proof. I have already stated that abstract doctrine of onus of proof should not be applied in arbitration proceedings. Mr. Dutt urged this proceedings before an arbitrator under Section 10A of the I.D. Act is not a Court proceeding at all. There is of course nothing to doubt that an arbitration proceedings before an arbitrator selected at the choice of parties is not a court proceeding and cannot be equated even to a proceedings before Industrial Tribunal, what has got very many attributes of a Court, but not a Court. The technical rules of the Evidence Act cannot be applied to arbitration proceedings. But the broad principle to scrutinise evidence and the effect of non-production of best evidence cannot be ignored. Mr. Dutt cited the case reported in (3) A. I. R. 1969 S.C. 983 (Central Bank of India). But that has no manner of application here, as it was regarding the function of Tribunal

under Section 33(2)(b) of the I.D. Act while giving approval to a findings arrived at in a domestic inquiry. An arbitration proceedings under Section 10A of I.D. Act is carried on by a person, as selected by the parties and such a person is to function, within the limits of the procedural rules of the I.D. Act. Though his position is superior to a private arbitrator, it is inferior to that of a Tribunal when from the decision or award given by him an aggrieved party might move the Supreme Court under Article 136 of the Constitution. That the strict rules of procedure of the Evidence Act is not applicable even to a Tribunal proceedings is well settled. This has been fully explained in the case of (4) Engineering Mazdoor Sabha and Hind Cycles (1962 LLJ II page 760), cited by Mr. Dutt and I have just assessed the evidence following that broad principle.

Be that as it is, the fact remains that the charts in Ex. G not supported by original documents, which could be produced cannot be safely relied upon. So far as the statements are contained therein there are further reasons for not depending upon the figures in G, which I propose to discuss in brief. For example, the average daily number of bags handled at Mokameh in 1971-72 is given at 3639. But the figure for six months January, February, November, December, 1971 and January, February, 1972 covering only a part of the same period is given at 14,000 in H. The discrepancy is rather too high, for which the figure in Ex. G cannot be safely relied upon, unless there are reasons to believe that the average daily handling of bag was only 3,034, in two months in 1970-71 though the daily average was 14000 bags. Similarly for Gaya depot, the daily average for 1970-71 is given at 3,637 and 2,859 for 1971-72 in Ex. G, but the daily average on six monthly basis for parts of those two years is stated to be 10,000 in Ex. H which is rather absurd on the face of it. I cannot thus rely on the figures as to daily average given in Ex. G. Of course the broad fact remains, that the volume of work, varies from day to day, month by month, year to year from the standpoint of both receipt of bags, and issue of bags. It becomes, therefore, difficult to assess the required labour strength when the very basis as to number of bags to be handled in an extremely uncertain factor in the daily working. So whatever be the strength of labour force assessed there would remain some idle labour on several days and that alone gives no occasion for reducing the labour force, for such casual occasion. The F. C. I. is thus rather obliged to meet heavy expenses on account of fall back wages.

Besides, it is significant that in the long written statement of the employer, the operational work, in the receipt side had just been described in details to be comprising of six stages and no mention had been made of such item of work as standardisation filling gunnies with loose grains to prescribed weight, salvaging of damaged food grains, unloading of loose food grains from the transport vehicle (be it wagon, truck or animal driven carts) into the godown and then filling the loose grain in gunnies upto prescribed weight with stitching clearly it cannot be just 10 per cent of the total work. It would appear from the award of Justice Banerjee that there are as many as 14 kinds of operation of which loading, unloading and weightment constitute the first 7 items and the last item and the remaining 6 items of operation are complicated and difficult in nature for which higher rates of payment had been prescribed naturally lowering the norm of workload compared to 90 bags. There is no scientific system yet formulated by the employer to effect a coordination of the various types of work which need be done in a team spirit dividing the mazdoors in gangs, such that each gang might be employed in doing the different variety of work in batches in the broad aspect of receipt and delivery of bags with due regards to a distinct operation, as to salvaging, standardisation and loading loose grains and bulk food grains in bags in a systematic manner. When I inspected the Gaya depot, I found at about 10-30 a.m. on 27-8-74 that hardly 50 workman were at work in the two sheds shown to me. But a huge quantity of wheat grains were lying scattered in the platform and in the floor of the godown, naturally because such grains needed salvaging and then filled up in gunny bags to prescribed weight and ultimately stacked in godown, fit to be delivered, according to requisition. There was none to perform such duty, and the loose food grains remained uncared for.

It is strange that the F. C. I. has as yet no clear cut plan about a gang strength. In the statement and in the evidence of Jamaluddin it is given to be 23, in the letter of Malay Ghosh Ex. 13 dated 17-12-73 it is given to be 14 for six Bihar depots, in the letter of the District Manager, Inland



depot Ex. 9 dated 2-3-73 for Durgapur, Siliguri and Suri depot at 14 and in Ex. H at 14 with a strength at above 25 per cent for ancillary labour against the gang strength. In spite, the gang composition in these three depots are still being allowed to be maintained most haphazardly varying from 16 to 39 as shown in Ex. E dated 30-7-71 with 2 gangs at Jamshedpur, 12 at Mokamah and 11 at Gaya. The idea of the employer about the labour strength at Gaya Jamshedpur equally vague as apparent from the evidence of OPW7 Debijyoti of Gaya and OPW5 Saifur Haque of Jamshedpur about which I already stated. The employer has adopted a policy of indecision all along. To my mind it appears that the gang strength should be 15 including munshi, so long as alternative employment is not given to them and the gangs would be comprising of 12 handling mazdoor and the total number of gangs need be determined, taking into consideration all variety of work and not merely the work in the receipt and issue side of operation just on the basis of number of bags received issued taking workload at 90 bags and due importance should be given to the employment of the labour gang, in other operational work, as standardisation, salvaging etc under proper supervision and guidance of F.C.I. officers in reduce idle hours of the mazdoor. The employment of a gang in the various work should be regulated and coordinated according to the exigencies of circumstances. But it appears that management has more or less surrendered to the wishes of the labour sardar so far as supervision of their work is concerned. The strength of ancillary mazdoor should also be properly determined upon consideration of the total volume of work and variety of work done by them. This might be proportional to the total number of handling mazdoor or gangwise, or shedwise or on the basis of tonnage of food grains handled on the basis of correct average figure of last three years. The number of ancillary mazdoor as given by the management in Ex. 13 and Ex. 9 are as follows :—

Depot	H/Labour	A/Labour
Digha	132	30
	84	20
Saharsa	60	16
Katihar	72	16
Mazafarpur	72	7
Forbesganj	24	6
Durgapur	60	20
Suri	24	10
Siliguri	132	42
	660	167

It is curious to note that there is wide variation at Katihar and Mazafarpur in the number of ancillary mazdoor as against the same number of handling mazdoor. Of course Ghanashyam Jana stated that in each gang there are 4 ancillary mazdoors for the purpose of helping the gang in performing their duties, besides doing other Miscellaneous work as sweeping, fugionation, separation and spreading of bags. So fixation of the number of gangs in each depot must be ensured first, to determine the number of ancillary mazdoor needed if the F.C.I. wants to work efficiently and control the handling cost. The employer produced a statement marked Ex. K, to show how the handling cost increased in these three depots. For Gaya and Mokamah depots the statement relates simply for two months that is, August and September, 1972. The cost is shown to be Rs. 3.09 at Gaya and for Mokamah it is Rs. 2 as an average for those two months. But in Ex. G the handling cost per tonne is given to be Rs. 3.15 at Gaya and at Rs. 5.60 at Mokamah for the year 1972-73. The discrepancy between the statements in Ex. K and Ex. G particularly for Mokamah is wide enough, and I do not consider it safe to rely on the statement in Ex. K. In the result it follows that the employer wanted to fix a gang strength at 14, but still allowed the gang strength to completely irregular as varying between 16 and 39. There is no effective supervision over the labour. The documents filed by the employer are self contradictory, not dependable and that the best evidence had not been produced without reasonable excuse. Besides, the employer has clear idea as to

But the fact remains that proper assessment of the labour strength, as required to perform the various nature of duties, for which the norms of workload are different and the volume of work is of an extremely variable nature, is a complicated question and no attempt had yet been made to determine the same, with the assistance of expert advice. There is no firm and durable policy followed, in the matter of procurement of food grains as between the State Government and the Food Corporation of India for which the staff is not feeling secure as to their future. B. Singh in cross-examination gave his opinion that now not even 200 workman are needed, and in near future the F.C.I. might be liquidated as the State Government is going to take over distribution of sugar.

Be that as it is, I can not determine the labour strength on the basis of the available evidence for the reasons given above. I, however, think it would be proper and very necessary to take the expert opinion of such organisation as the National Productivity Council or similar organisation to assess the workload of various items of work and assess the labour strength, now required to perform the duties in each of the depots, properly and in a co-ordinated manner to reduce the idle hours and minimise the expenses. I find no reason why the Union would object to that. If I accept the contents in the letter of B. K. Singh to Narayan dated 17-6-71 [Ex. 0(1)] Mr. Ghanashyam Jana himself told that F.C.I. was not a "dharma-sala". Moreover the Union has nothing to loose if a scientific determination of labour strength according to the volume of work and workload be made, as there is already an assurance given by the management in their letter dated 14-12-72 that the intention of the management was not to retrench the labourers already departmentalised at the aforesaid three depots, whatever be the decision of the Arbitrator (vide Ex. 15). If there is excess of labour, as I just feel on inspection at Gaya depot, such mazdoors would not lose their job, but otherwise absorbed, in future vacancies arising from retirement, death or dismissal and even employed in neighbouring depots, as and when necessary. The only thing is that future recruitment might be kept in abeyance.

Issue No. 4 and the first part of issue No. 1, are thus disposed of. I also find that shift of 8 hours includes one hour as recess period. The evidence of Ghanashyam Jana is that for the mazdoors, the working hours is from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M. including a recess period from 1 P.M. to 2 P.M. and this is the uniform rule followed by F.C.I. everywhere. His evidence is not challenged. But there is no reason to reduce it to 6-1/2 hours as in the case of clerical and subordinate staff.

Issues no. 2(a), 2(b), 3 and 1(b).

It is claimed by the Union that the mazdoors in the depots are entitled to the benefit of the same wage structure and conditions of service—fringe benefits, fall back wages and incentive wages, as being given to their counterparts in West Bengal as an assurance to that effect was given by the Regional Manager at the time of departmentalisation, as embodied in the telex Ex. 1 and also because such discrimination is unjustified.

Admittedly, the wage structure comprising of basic pay, dearness allowance, additional dearness allowance, city compensatory allowance, house rent allowance, as mentioned in Ex. 1(a) are available to the mazdoors in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal. But the mazdoors involved in this dispute are being paid at fixed rate, as stated in para 18 of the Union's statement and this is admitted by the management in para 12(b) of their statement, except that there is no mention about the wages paid to munshis and ancillary mazdoors. But there are munshis and ancillary mazdoor as apparent from the term of reference itself. Besides the ad-hoc rates of wages, as settled between the management and the Union, indicates that the rates of wages for ancillary mazdoor (सुपरव्हाइजर) सहायक सुपरव्हाइजर 'गोपस्वर' and sardar is identical with the wage rates, at fixed amount, as stated in para 18 of the Union's statement vide [Ex. 1(c)] marked without objection.

The question also is if the mazdoors are entitled to the same conditions of service, as to wages, fringe benefit, incentive wages, fall back wages exactly at par with the mazdoors in West Bengal.

Both parties referred to several decisions of the Supreme Court in support of their respective contentions as to how the Wage structure of the workmen should be fixed and

how the conditions of service as to fringe benefits laid down. According to the employer, the wage rates of the Handling Mazdoors should be fixed on the basis of the prevailing wage rates of workmen employed in other concerns in Bihar—following the principle of fixation of wages on the well-known rule of Industry cum Region. There is no dispute on the point that the Handling Mazdoors of F.C.I. employed in Calcutta are paid wages including Basic Pay, Dearness Allowance, Additional Dearness Allowance, City Compensatory Allowance and House Rent Allowance etc. as given in Annexure 'B' which is marked in Ex. 1(a) without any objection from the employer. On the other hand, the mazdoors i.e., the ancillary workers, handling labourers, mandal, munhis and sardars are paid wages fixed on an ad hoc basis from the 1st week September, 1971 in pursuance of a discussion between the Management and the representatives of the Union vide [Ex. 1(c)]. Shri Ashoke Ghosh stated that the contents in Ex. 1(b) & (c) are all correct and that the wage structure of the workmen employed in the Dock Labour Board and their conditions of services are exactly the same, as those employed in the different depots under the Food Corporation of India in West Bengal. He further stated that the nature of duties performed by mandals is the same as the duties performed by tindals employed in the Dock and Port. So clearly the wage-structure and conditions of service of the mazdoors in Calcutta was formulated by the F.C.I. on the same pattern as in the Dock & Port. The employer examined the Superintendent of the Bihar State Warehousing Corporation, Ajit Kumar Verma who stated that the handling mazdoors are engaged by them on contract basis and they are paid at fixed rates on Piece Rate basis for different items of work as loading, unloading, weighment etc. at rates given in Ex. 1. The Union challenged the correctness of the statement in Ex. 1 as original records and circular with reference to which the charts has been prepared, are not produced. It is, however, apparent from the contents of the letter Ex. 1, that they employ casual hands. The employer also examined Shri P. L. Joshi, Assistant Mill Manager of Harinagar Sugar Mill, situated in the district of Champaran in Bihar and he mentioned about the wages paid to the handling mazdoors employed by them the particulars of which is stated in the Annexure of the written statement and is marked Ex. 1(1) through the witness. This witness stated that fringe benefits are given according to the recommendations made by the Second Wage Board for Sugar Industry. He stated that the handling mazdoors were known as Palledar are expected to handle 50 bags in a shift of 8 hours. It is to be noted that under F.C.I. mazdoors are expected to deal with 90 bags with a lead of 66 feet.

On the other hand, the Union produced a document marked Ex. 11 showing the wage-structure and fringe benefits of the Steel Industry Workers and a document Ex. 12 showing the wage-structure and fringe benefits of the workers of Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. Baruni Oil Refinery workers at Mokameh. Obviously, the principle of fixation of wages on the basis of Industry cum Region, should be carefully applied after taking into consideration various factors.

In the case of (5) Noviks Dry Cleaners vs. its workmen reported in 1962 LLJ Volume I at page 271, it had been held that in order to make comparison of one establishment with another, engaged in the same nature of business in the same region, it is necessary before such comparison is made to compare their respective standing, the extent of the labour force, the extent of their customers and the standard of the Profit and Loss. In the case of (6) Williamsons (I) Pvt. Ltd. and their workmen as reported in 1962 LLJ Volume I at page 302, it had been held that in deciding the question of wage-structure comparison on the wage-structure in another establishment in the same region can be made after consideration of the extent of business carried by the said concerns, the capital investment by them, the profits made by them, the nature of the business carried on by them, their standing, the strength of their labour force, the financial position of the company etc.

In the case of the workmen of (7) Hindustan Motors and another reported in 1962 LLJ, Volume II, at page 352, it was held that it is ordinarily desirable to secure as much uniformity as possible in the wage-scale of different concerns of the same nature in the same Region, and this may not always be possible, when there is difference in

financial capacity of the different concerns. In this case, the scale of pay and dearness allowance had been fixed at the same rates as granted by the major Engineering Tribunal Award covering a large number of major Engineering Industry in West Bengal, even though Hindustan Motors Company an Engineering concern of comparable status was not involved in the reference and the award.

In the case of (8) French Motor Car Co. Ltd., and their workmen reported in 1962 LLJ, Volume II, at page 744, the principle of fixation of wages on Industry cum Region basis, had been discussed and it was laid down that the comparison was restricted to those industry as carrying business, on the same line having comparable financial standing and it was further observed that when there was a large disparity between the two concerns in the same line of business, it would not be proper to apply the principle of Industry cum Region formula. In the case reported in (9) 1964 LLJ, Vol. I at page 342 (Greeves Cotton & Co. Ltd. and their workmen, the Supreme Court considered the decisions in the case of Hindustan Motors and French Motor Car Co., assisted before and it was held that in applying the Industry cum Region formula for fixing wage-scale it should be proper to put greater stress on the industry side of the formula when there are large numbers of industrial concerns of same kind in the same Region carrying on the same nature of Industry. But when the number of comparable concerns in a particular Region is small, the region part of the formula assumes greater importances. The formula on such a situation assumes importance particularly in fixing wages of the clerical and subordinate staff and not so much for the factory workers.

The entire principle behind application of Industry cum Region formula in the matter of fixation of pay is evolved in order to avoid unfair competition between different establishments of comparable nature which obviously creates Industrial unrest. In the case of (10) Kamany Metals Alloy and their workmen reported in 1967, LLJ, II at page 55, it has so held that in general only comparable units may be compared but not units which are dissimilar.

In the case of (11) Orient Paper Mills, reported in 1969, LLJ, Vol. II at page 398, the principle of fixation of minimum wages on the basis of Industry cum Region basis was considered in respect of a paper mill. It was found that there was no other concerns in the same line of business as the Company in question in that region. But the Tribunal took into account wage-structure of other industries which are as nearly as possible to the line of business carried on by this Industry and it was upheld for the limited purpose of fixing minimum wages. In the same volume in the case of (12) Gujarat Electricity Board, Baroda, at page 791, the Supreme Court considered the decision in Williamsons Pvt. Ltd. reported in 1962, Vol. I LLJ, at page 302 already considered by me and found that this Electric Company was not comparable with other Electric Companies in the same Region when the activities of those concerns are different. This decision reaffirms the proposition of wage fixation on the principle of Industry cum Region basis and enunciated that it should be carefully applied and that dissimilar nature of Industries should not be taken into account for the purpose of comparison. Apparently there is no similar industry as the Food Corporation of India in the Bihar Region even though there are concerns employing handling mazdoors, just as Harinagar Sugar Mill or the State Warehousing Corporation. Apparently the Warehousing Corporation employs only casual labour when needed and the wages paid them can not be a basis for comparison.

The learned lawyer for the employer also relied in the reported case of Greeves Cotton & Co. (1964, LLJ, Vol. I, at page 342) where the question arose whether the Tribunal Award was wrong for not following the Industry cum Region principle as laid down in the case of Hindustan Motors and French Motor Car Co. and I have already discussed the principle connected therein.

I have considered about the principle as to when the Region part becomes important and when stress is to be given on the Industry part for the sake of comparison and I don't find anything in that decision to support the contention of Mr. Dutt. Mr. Dutt also referred to the case of French Motor Car Co. as already considered by me but there is nothing to indicate that wage structure of the Bihar



State Warehousing Corporation, Patna and the Harinagar Sugar Mills at Champaran can be taken for comparison for the purpose of fixation of wages for the workmen involved in this dispute, when they are carrying on business of entirely different nature. At the same time it is not safe to rely on the recommendations as to wage-structure and fringe benefits as made by the Central Wage Board for the Coal Mine Industry in India relied on by the Union except that an uniformity in conditions of service had been recommended throughout India for the workmen working in different Regions (vide Ex. 3). It is, however, to be noted that the Food Corporation of India in their letter dated January 4, 1974 forwarded a proposal as to revised Pay Structure, fringe benefits etc. for the departmentalised labourers at Delhi depots and it is the same in respect to pay scale, dearness allowance, additional dearness allowance, city compensatory allowance, house rent allowance, gang strength etc. as prevailing in Calcutta (vide Ex. 5). It is to be noted in this connection that Delhi Region is not including in the Eastern Zone at all though Bihar is a part of that Zone.

It is of course not known whether the recommendations made by the Management as contained in Ex. 5, had been finalised. The fact, however, remains that revised Wage-structure, fringe benefits etc. for the departmental labour at Delhi depots as a final decision of the head office of Corporation was offered for acceptance of Shri Jana (PW2), the Joint Secretary of the Union.

The employer produced a copy of the notification dated 9th May, 1968 wherein the minimum rates of wages of the different categories of employees employed in "Rice Mills, Flour Mills, Dal Mills and Oil Mills" for the whole of the State of Bihar was fixed under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. The Minimum rates of wages for different categories of workmen is mentioned in that notification (vide Ex. F). The minimum wages Act is intended for fixation of minimum wages for employment in such industries as specified in the schedule of the Act where the workers' organisation are poorly developed and, therefore, the workers, bargaining capacity is very little which gives a large handle of exploitation of labour by the employer. So the rates of minimum wages as fixed in the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 for such small industries so to speak can hardly be adopted in determining the Wage-structure in the instance case.

As an industry within the meaning of the Industrial Disputes Act, F.C.I. can have no bearing with such industries as covered under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. The Food Corporation of India, is quite a big concern, employing a huge staff, all over India. Jamaluddin stated that there are 23 depots in Bihar and that there would be 1200/1300 clerks, peons and officers. He further stated that except for house rent and compensatory allowance, the scale of pay, dearness allowance and other fringe benefits are uniform throughout India under the Food Corporation of India. It appears from the evidence that the clerks and sub-staff are not transferred from one region to another, except on promotion or on special prayer. It appears from Ex. 4 that the consumer price index number for Industrial workers in Bihar (Jamsedpur, Monghyer etc.) is higher than those at Calcutta, Howrah and Asansol. It is also proved by evidence that the handling mazdoors perform the same nature of work as those in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal. I am conscious that there is no other concern near Gaya, Mokmah and Jamsedpur carrying on same nature of work as F.C.I. and, therefore, industry part of the formula can not be applied and the region part would be applied if there were concerns in the region, carrying on similar line of business. This is an established principle. But I do not get any concern carrying on similar nature of business, of comparable status and standing. Mr. Butt referred to the case reported in (13) Factories & Labour Reports Vol. 25, 1972 at page 353 (M/s. Unichem Laboratories Ltd.) wherein the question of fixing wages on industry-cum-region formula was discussed at great length and the decision in Greaves Cotton & Co. already referred to was considered and followed. In fact, in deciding wage structure of these workers, the industry-cum-region rule affords no guideline for all practical purposes. Moreover, the employer assured the Union in their letter dated 28-7-73, Ex. 14 that the workers in Assam and Orissa who were departmentalised with effect from 15-6-73 would get the same rates of wages etc. as would be awarded in this proceeding. It virtually follows that there would be no discrimination amongst the mazdoors in the different regions of Assam and Orissa situa-

ted in the Eastern Zone. B. K. Sinha in his letter Ex. O(6) in reply to the telex of Gurbuksh Singh Ex. L, stated that the Labour Minister, Bihar felt that Bihar being a part of Eastern Zone there was no question of applying the terms and conditions of service as applicable to workers at Manmad situated in the Western Zone. It follows that she felt that Bihar as a part of the Eastern Zone should follow West Bengal pattern. In fact, in the letter of B. K. Sinha Ex. O(6), he more or less explained why he agreed to extend to the departmentalised workers the same conditions of service as already granted in West Bengal. There is not a whisper in this long letter Ex. O(6) that Sinha considered his decision in Ex. 1 to have been arising from compulsion and that he considered his decision to be wrong. When the F.C.I. agrees to extend the same terms and conditions of service, as might be decided in this proceeding to the workers in Assam and Orissa, they virtually admit that all their workmen in the Eastern Zone should be governed by the same terms and conditions. The region-cum-Worker formula here assumes zone-cum-same employer rule to avoid discrimination, which leads to real discontent amongst the employees.

In (14) A.I.R. 1973 S.C. 2758 (Woolcombers of India Ltd. vs. Workers Union) cited by Mr. Dutt, the decision in French Motor Car Company and Greaves Cotton & Co., as already discussed had been considered and the rule as to the circumstances when region part gets importance was further explained. The whole thing is to find out a comparable concern and here there is none such in Bihar, carrying on even a comparable or similar nature of business. The Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers had recommended certain wages, fringe benefits etc. for Port and Dock workers and the Corporation agreed to implement those recommendations in respect to their employees in West Bengal region. Ex. 7, the memo of settlement under Section 12(3) of the I. D. Act dated 14-11-70 indicates that the F.C.I. agreed to introduce fringe benefits on the pattern prevalent in the Dock Labour Board, Calcutta and that the rates of wages was fixed on the pattern of Dock Labour Board as per letter of Zonal Manager, Calcutta dated 18-5-71 (Ex. 8).

The contention of the employer that the wage structure requires no revision and that the workmen should be treated as daily rated, at Rs. 6 per day for handling mazdoor and as Rs. 4.50 per day for ancillary mazdoors, is clearly untenable.

Apparently it would be a complete departure from the existing pay structure. It would, therefore, be fair and proper, to fix up the wage structure on the West Bengal pattern; not merely because it had been agreed to, but that otherwise it would be creating unnecessary discrimination without reasonable grounds. Apart from the unjust discrimination in wages between workman and workman, doing the same work, under the same employer it is clear that the present wage structure is so low that it is obviously below the subsistence level.

The wage structure is thus brought in line and at par with the rates prevalent in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal as follows:—

(1) Scale of Pay

Sardar	Rs. 150-4-170-5-190
Mandla/Munshi	Rs. 125-3-134-4-170
Handling labour	Rs. 115-3-136-4-160
Male ancillary	Rs. 104-2-116-3-140
Female ancillary	Rs. 100-2-130.

(2) Dearness allowance

Basic pay upto Rs.	Amount of D. A.
139	Rs. 72
140-179	Rs. 99
180-239	Rs. 123

(3) Additional Dearness allowance (above the rates of D.A. fixed at 215 index (1949=100) for every pointwise or fall at the rates below to be reviewed at the end of every six months.

Basic range of pay	Adtl. D. A. per month per point
100-109 . . .	0.72% of pay.
110-119 . . .	0.70% of pay subject to a minimum of 78-48
120-159 . . .	60% of pay subject to a minimum of 83-30
160-249 . . .	50% of pay subject to a minimum of 95-40

(4) No City Compensatory Allowance would be allowed as there is no evidence on the point. Besides, Gaya, Jamsedpur and Mokmah can not be called specially costly place.

(5) House Rent Allowance shall be paid at 8 per cent of basic pay subject to a maximum of Rs. 12/- p.m. more or less in line with the rates applicable to decentralised labour of Docks and Port followed by F.C.I. in fixing wage structure in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal. In fixing such rate I have also taken into account that the total pay packet of the labourers, as a consequence of this award would be much increased. But it cannot be avoided.

(6) Overtime wages are to be paid to all workers at 1-1/2 times basic pay, dearness allowance and house rent allowance.

(7) Fertiliser allowance—Ancillary workers is to be Re. 1/- extra per day per head for handling fertiliser bags.

(8) Ancillary workers are to be paid 50 per cent of total daily wages and allowances for work of salvaging of damaged food grain bags.

(9) Munshi, as they are, will get Re. 1/- extra per day of hooking. I adopt the Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal pattern in fixing wage structure except for C.C.A. and double operation and reduce the rate of H.R.A. as given in Annexure B to the Union statement marked Ex. 1(a).

I now take up the question of fall back wages and attendance allowance of piecerated handling mazdoors mandals, sardars, munshis and ancillary mazdoors. This means guaranteed minimum wages.

The rates applicable in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal is given in annexure B. I find no reason for discrimination.

The employer suggested in para 14 that it should be paid for 16 days. In West Bengal it is paid for 21 days plus 4/5 days for weekly off and it would be unfair to reduce the number of days.

The rates per day includes basic pay, D.A. & A.D.A., C.C.A. and H.R.A.

The rates of D.A. will be reviewed every six months on the 1st October and 1st April on the basis of an average All India working class C.P.I. No. (base 1949=100) for preceding six months of January—June and July—December respectively.

Method of calculation.—(1) Basic wages are to be divided by 26 to arrive at daily rate.

(2) To convert D.A., A.D.A. and H.R.A. into daily rates—the total allowance per month is to be multiplied by 12 (months) and then divided by 365 (days in a year).

The employer suggested some conditions in para 14(d) for entitlement to guaranteed wages which are as follows :—

(1) It will be paid only in the event of failure or inability of the management to provide work as per direction to the mazdoors.

(2) In the event of unauthorised absence or unauthorised leave, the number of minimum guaranteed wage shall be proportionately reduced.

(3) The mazdoors shall report for duty at the scheduled time and place.

These conditions are just and fair and must be applied in respect to the workmen in these three depots.

Attendance allowance shall be paid at Re. 1.75 per day for 4/5 days, as the case might be in a month plus D.A., A.D.A., H.R.A. for those days following the rule of calculations as stated before subject to the same conditions for entitlement of fall-back wages.

I now take up the question of fringe benefits—such as (1) Leave facilities, (2) provident fund, (3) gratuity, (4) children's educational allowance, (5) reimbursement of tuition fees (6) privilege ticket order (7) holiday, (8) funeral expenses etc. and (9) reimbursement of medical expenses.

The benefits as available to the workers in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal is stated in Ex.1 (a), which is annexure

to the statement and is not challenged. The employer, however, gave some counterproposals in paragraph 15 of their statement I am of opinion that it would be creating unjust discrimination amongst workers. It, however, appears from Ex. A that provisions for Children's Educational Allowance has already been made in line with the provisions in Calcutta for the workmen in Bihar. It also appears from Ex. B that provision for ex-gratia payment has been made for the departmentalised workers as these three depots as per notification no. I.C-3(4)/73 dated September 1, 1973.

As for travelling fares, it is not clear from Ex. 1(a) if it is available once in two years. I decide that it shall be given once in two years, restricted to the home town of the workmen, after one year's continuous service.

Regarding the provision for reimbursement of medical expenses as in para 11 of Ex. 1(a), it is recommended that claim for reimbursement should be carefully scrutinised by a responsible officer, selected by the Regional Manager, before it is sanctioned and it shall not exceed Rs. 16 per month except under special circumstances, subject to sanction by the Regional Manager, himself or some officer as selected by him. Provisions for leave, L.P.F., gratuity, holidays, funeral expenses, reimbursement of medical expenses must be identical with Calcutta rules, which is given in annexure 'A' to the award and made as a part of the same. The issue as to fringe benefit is thus disposed of, subject to what is stated before.

The incentive scheme was introduced in Calcutta with effect from 16-12-1970 and it applies to sardars, mandals and handling mazdoor. The Union claims that the said provision should be made applicable here. Besides, it is claimed that the munshis should get the benefit of the same. I have already discussed about the position of munshi. I find no reason to extend the scheme to munshi. By the award of Shri B. N. Banerjee it was decided that the calculation on percentage basis should be made on the basis of full wages and not basic wages (vide Ex. 16).

I adopt the same rules as in Calcutta vis-a-vis West Bengal read with that award and the scheme as awarded is made annexure B, as a part and parcel of this award.

Apparently these Mazdoors were paid abnormally low wages for a long time in spite of assurances given otherwise at the time of departmentalisation. The employer assured by the letter dated 22-12-72 that the award of the Arbitrator would have retrospective effect with effect from 1st May, 1971 i.e., the date of departmentalisation.

Mr. Dutt urged that even though this award must have effect from 1-5-71 as already agreed to in writing (Ex. 6), retrospective effect would be given as to fringe benefit. The assurance given in Ex. 6 is explicit and covers the entire award.

The fringe benefit cover in all 11 items [vide Ex. 1(a)].

Obviously there would be no retrospective effect so far as items 8 (holiday), 9 (funeral expenses) 10 (supply of soaps, towels and protective gear etc.) are concerned.

Regarding item no. 2 (ex-gratia payment when a worker suffers from Tuberculosis etc.) which is already being given from 1-9-73 (vide Ex. B), there would be no retrospective operation. Item No. 5 (Children's Educational Allowance) had been introduced as per Ex. A and is thus already available from 15-6-73 and I give no retrospective effect as this would lead to complication. Similarly item no. 6 (reimbursement of tuition fees) would not have retrospective effect.

Item No. 7 would be effective counting the past service, as travelling concession is available once in two years and the workers were departmentalised more than 3 years ago.

There would be no retrospective effect as to Casual Leave and maternity leave. But period of privilege leave and sick leave being increased would have retrospective effect. Similarly contributory provident fund (item no. 3) and gratuity (item no. 4) would have retrospective effect from 1-5-71.

So far as wage structure, fall back wages, incentive scheme, obviously these would be paid with effect from 1-5-71 retrospectively, as per agreement and assurance of the employer.

Mr. Dutt urged that the arrears in wages, should be directed to be paid in instalments. But there was no such prayer in the statement. No evidence was adduced to that effect. It can not also be said that F.C.I. is not in a position to meet the dues under this award, which is retrospective in operation since 1-5-71. Besides, the handling mazdoors were paid rather at a very low rate at about Rs. 135/-, since departmentalisation. Hence I find no reasonable ground to permit payment by instalment. The award becomes enforceable on the expiry of thirty days from the date of publication. I have no discretion in altering that date, as it was already agreed that awarded sum will be payable from 1-5-71. The case cited by Mr. Dutt reported in (15) I. F. L. R. 1965 Vol. II at page 137 (All India Reserve Bank Employees Association) has no manner of application in the instant case. In the case reported in (16) I.F.L.R. 1973 Vol 26 at page 433 (Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation) cited by Mr. Dutt, payment of arrears of overtime wages by 12 equal instalment over a period of 2 years was directed as the parties agreed to that. But in the instant case there is no such agreement. Rather Mr. Sen Gupta opposed that I can only suggest that a sizeable part of the amount received as arrears by each of the workmen might be properly invested in savings account by the workmen under the advice of the Union, so that the money might be properly utilised, on occasions of future need. Before I conclude, I must note that the disposal of the case was much delayed, as the employer took several adjournments some of which would have been avoided, by the F.C.I. and for which Mr. Sen Gupta prayed for costs. I made it clear as per order dated 27-3-74 and 9-7-74 that I shall consider about payment of costs to the Union if necessary in the award. Considering the facts and circumstances I award a cost at Rs. 1,000 (Rupees one thousand) only in favour of the workmen, represented by the Union, conducting the proceedings.

This is the award.

K. K. MITRA, Arbitrator

10-10-1974

#### ANNEXURE 'A' FRINGE BENEFITS

##### 1. LEAVE

- (a) Privilege Leave.—1/12 of the number of days actually attended in a year. It will be accumulate upto 90 days.
- (b) Casual Leave.—Casual leave may be granted for 7 days in a year.
- (c) Sick Leave.—Sick Leave may be granted for 10 days in a year. It will be accumulated upto 60 days.
- (d) Injury Leave.—Any worker who is injured not through his own negligence but in execution of his duty may be granted leave on account of injury upto a period not exceeding 4 months.

Leave on account of injury should be treated as period spent on duty for all purposes except, that the period of leave on account of injury shall not count towards the earnings of the privilege leave.

Subject to a maximum of 4 months leave for injury sustained on one occasion leave on account of injury may be granted more than once for the same injury or injuries on the recommendation of the Medical Officer.

##### 2. EX-GRATIA

- (a) Leave and Allowance.—A worker who is in the opinion of the Medical Officer, is suffering from Tuberculosis, Leprosy, Cancer and Mental Derailment shall after the expiry of the period of leave due to him under the Corporation's rules be entitled to further special leave without pay not exceeding 18 months. During the period of special leave the worker would be entitled to an Ex-gratia allowance of Rs. 50/- per month.
- (b) After Care.—When a worker suffering from Tuberculosis, Leprosy, Cancer and Mental Derailment are declared by the Medical Officer in consultation with

the specialist to be free from disease but is recommended light work he will be entitled to a after care leave not exceeding 6 months from the date of such declaration. During the period of after care leave a worker shall be entitled to an allowance of Rs. 50/- per month.

Cases of the workers suffering from Tuberculosis, Leprosy, Cancer and Mental Derailment will be reviewed by the Medical Officer in consultation with the Specialists not later than one year, thereafter every 3 months. If as a result of the review the Medical Officer is of the opinion that there is no reasonable chance of recovery of the patients the case should be reported for reference to a Medical Board.

##### 3. CONTRIBUTORY PROVIDENT FUND :

C.P.F. is deducted @ Rs. 8 per cent of pay and D.A. from workers who are completed 240 days of service.

##### 4. GRATUITY :

- (a) In case of workers died prematurely their cases will be dealt with as per Gratuity scheme of the Calcutta Dock Labour Board for payment of Gratuity.
- (b) Gratuity should be paid 20 days of pay and D.A. for completion of each year of service.

##### 5. CHILDREN'S EDUCATION ALLOWANCE :

- (i) All decasualised workers under FCI will be eligible for the Children's Education Allowance from their respective dated of decasualisation.
- (ii) Where the husband and the wife are both in the such decasualised workers of FCI the Children Education Allowance will admissible in respect of one of them only.
- (iii) The Children Education Allowance will be admissible to a worker who is on duty, under suspension or on leave but will not be admissible to deceased, retired or discharged persons. If however, he/she is discharged or dismissed as a disciplinary measure during the academic year, the allowance will discontinue from the month following that during which he/she is discharged or dismissed. On the death or retirement of the worker during the academic year, the allowance will continue till the end of the year.

##### 6. REIMBURSEMENT OF TUITION FEES :

- (i) All departmentalised workers excluding temporarily recruited workers Reimbursement of Tuition fees also be allowed.

##### 7. PRIVILEGE TICKET ORDER :

The P.T.O. Concession shall be admissible to those decasualised workers of the Food Corporation of India, who have been in continuous service of Food Corporation of India for not less than one year.

##### 8. HOLIDAY :

- (a) Paid Holiday.—8 paid holidays in a year. If a worker is not booked for work then he will get 1 day's pay, DA, HRA & CCA besides 21 days minimum guarantee wages. But if he is booked for work then he will get 1 day's pay and DA extra besides 1 day's pay DA, HRA & CCA along with 31 days minimum guarantee wages.
- (b) NON Paid Holiday.—11 Non paid Holidays in a year. If a worker is booked on non paid holidays he will get same as paid holidays. If a worker is not booked he will get attendance allowance for the day including DA, HRA & CCA.

##### 9. FUNERAL EXPENSES :

Funeral Expense of Rs. 100/- paid to the families of the deceased workmen.

10. Soaps and Towels are supplied to Ancillary workers. Besides overall protective gears etc. are supplied to Ancillary workers working in fumigation work.

11. Re-imbursement of Medical Expenses for workers and their families.—The departmentalised workers and their family are getting medical re-imbursement for outdoor treatment.

#### ANNEXURE 'B'

#### INCENTIVE SCHEME FOR HANDLING WORKERS OF THE FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA

##### I. SHORT TITLE & THE SCOPE :

- (a) The scheme may be called Incentive Scheme for handling workers of the godowns of the Food Corporation of India (payment by results) at Gaya, Mokamah and Jamsedpur.
- (b) The scheme shall apply to the following categories of workers :
  - (i) Handling Sardars,
  - (ii) Handling Mondals,
  - (iii) Handling Mazdoors.

##### II. SHIFT HOURS :

Effective shift hours will be Eight hours including one hour's lunch break. Shift hours will be fixed by each Depot according to the work pattern and may be changed from season to season or for other operational reasons after giving at least 15 days' notice.

##### III. DETERMINATION OF OUTPUT :

The output of a gang shall be determined according to the tallies of the number of bags handled during different operations maintained by the godown staff of the Food Corporation of India. Per capita output will be worked out by dividing total number of bags handled by the gang by the number of Mazdoors in the gang. Incentive rates will be applicable to the per capita handling of the Mazdoors. If work is available for at least half the shift hours, the workers must reach the norm to be entitled for the minimum wage. If sufficient work is not available during the shift to the worker for completing the norm he will get minimum wage. When the output of a worker is below the scheduled norm in respect of different operations, except for reasons beyond his control he will be paid proportionately less according to his actual output. In such cases, when he is paid only the pro rata payment, it will be open to him to make a representation to the godown officer of the Corporation that his low output was due to reasons beyond his control and ask for wages on minimum guarantee basis. Since the norms of performance have been fixed taking into account the average loss of handling time i.e., occasion in the course of handling work, there shall be no separate payment for any idle time.

If in any shift the number of workers in a gang reporting for work is below full strength and if the vacancy cannot be filled up immediately, wages as determined under the Incentive Scheme, shall be divided amongst those present.

##### IV. NORM :

- (a) Handling.—90 bags weighing between 66 kgs. and 95 kgs. each per Mazdoor per working shift for loading/unloading work and 38 bags weighing between 66 kgs. and 95 kgs. each per Mazdoor per working shift for standardisation work.
- (b) Stacking.—8 bags weighing between 66 kgs. and 95 kgs. each high.
- (c) Lead.—66 ft.

##### V. RATES :

All rates are with reference to 90 food grain bags unless otherwise stated (weighing between 66 to 95 kgs.). Stacking will always refer to standard stacking of interlocking pattern with bases of standard size with a view to conserve maximum storage space.

Sl. No.	Nature of work according to agreement dated 16-4-69 between the Corporation and FCI Workers Union	Rate for 90 bags weighing between 66 kgs. and 95 kgs. and stocking upto 8 bags high.	Norms in bags.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
		Rs.	
(i)	Unloading from wagons/trolleys, trucks and stacking in godowns.	4.42	90
(ii)	Unloading from wagons and loading into trolleys.	3.56	90
(iii)	Destacking foodgrain bags in godowns and loading into transport vehicles.	3.56	90
(iv)	Unloading from wagons at the godowns siding and stacking in shed/platform/ground.	2.70	90
(v)	Loading into trolleys from godowns served with siding.	3.56	90
(vi)	Delivery to recipients.	3.56	90
(vii)	Weighment.	5.34	74
(viii)	Physical verification.	7.98	50
(ix)	Standardisation	10.67	38
(x)	Filling gunnies with loose grains to prescribed weight with stitching and stacking/loading/delivery.	8.90	40
(xi)	Unloading of bulk foodgrains from wagons/trucks, animal driven vehicles in the godowns, filling gunnies with bulk grains upto prescribed weight with stitching/stacking/loading/delivery.	14.24	25
(xii)	Salvaging of damaged foodgrains.	19.63	20
(xiii)	Rebagging.	10.67	38
(xiv)	Breaking of stacks and restacking.	3.56	9

##### VI. INCENTIVES TO WORKERS :

- (i) Stacking 8 bags high : Full wage.  
 9 to 10 bags—10% extra of full wages i.e. Pay, DA & HRA  
 11 to 14 bags—25% " " "  
 15 to 16 bags—30% " " "  
 17 bags and beyond.—50% " " "
- (ii) Handling. 90 bags full wage.  
 For the purpose of determining output on handling 'day' will be considered 91 to 110 bags—5% extra of Full wages i.e. Pay D.A. & H.R.A.,  
 111 to 120 bags—15% -Do-  
 121 to 150 bags—25% -Do-  
 151 and beyond—50% -Do-  
 and percentage will be taken as unit and percentage will be applicable over the normal wages over the respective slabs.
- (iii) Lead. 12% extra of full wages i.e., Pay, D.A. & H.R.A. for every 33 ft. lead, after the first slab of 66 ft. has been covered.

##### VII. HANDLING OF BAGS MORE THAN 95 kgs.

Handling of bags weighting more than.

5 kgs.—5% extra on all rates.

##### VIII. INCENTIVE TO SARDARS AND MONDALS.

Sardars and Mondals are paid the same quantum of incentive wages earned by the individual handling worker of the respective gang.

[No. L. 42013/1/73/LR-III]

K. K. MITRA, Arbitrator

New Delhi, the 19th October, 1974

**S.O. 2878.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs F. F. Morris, Cochin Palletising Service, Cochin and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th October, 1974.

BEFORE THIRU T. PALANIAPPAN, B.A., B.L.,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Madras.

(Constituted by the Central Government)

Industrial Dispute No. 35 of 1974

Madras, the 18th September, 1974

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the management of M/s. F.F. Morris, Cochin Palletising Service, Kunnumpuram, Cochin-682001).

BETWEEN

The workmen represented by :

The General Secretary, Cochin Port Thozhilali Union  
INTUC Office, Mattancherry, Cochin-682001.

AND

M/s. F. F. Morris, Cochin Palletising Service, Kunnum-  
puram Cochin-682001

Reference:

Order No. L.35011/3/64-P&D dated 18th July, 1974  
of the Ministry of Labour, Government of India,  
New Delhi.

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal, upon perusing the reference and all other material papers on record and the parties being absent, this Tribunal made the following

AWARD

The Government of India, by their order No. L-35011/31  
64-P&D, dated 18-7-1974 of the Ministry of Labour, referred  
the following issues to this Tribunal for adjudication:—

"Whether the management of Messrs. F.F. Morris, Cochin-1, is justified in denying employment to Ser-  
vashri P. P. Antony, T. D. Sasidaran and M. V.  
Henry, palletising workers and bonus for the years  
1970 to 1973 to them. If not to what relief are  
the workers entitled?"

2. This case was posted for appearance on 9-9-1974. As  
the parties did not appear in Court on 9-9-1974 the dispute  
was adjourned to 18-9-1974. The Union was served on  
4-9-1974 and the Management on 5-9-1974. In spite of that  
to-day (18-9-1974) the parties were absent.

3. On 2-8-1974, the employer had sent a letter along with  
the settlement receipts passed by the employees, stating that  
the dispute has since been settled amicably between the  
parties and requesting this Tribunal to pass an award on  
the basis of the settlement

4. Again the employer has written a letter dated 7-9-1974  
submitting that the dispute has already been settled amicably  
directly between parties and that the matter may be dropped.  
Anyhow, the parties have to report settlement if any either  
in person before me or their authorised representative must  
report the settlement.

5. The union, though served, did not choose to appear  
and file claim statement, if any. As the matter seems to  
have been settled, the parties are not anxious to come and

report settlement. In the absence of the parties no com-  
promise can be recorded.

6. In the result, I answer the reference granting no relief to  
the workers.

Dated, this 18th day of September, 1974.

T PALANIAPPAN, Presiding Officer

[No. L-35011/3/74-P&D/CMT]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 21 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० आ०-2879-यत. केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे  
उपावद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में कान्टिनेन्टल कन्ट्रक्शन  
(प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड विशाखापत्तनम के प्रबन्धन में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों  
और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यत. केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए  
निर्दिष्ट करना बाध्यता समझती है;

अतः अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14)  
की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा  
प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधि-  
करण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० नरसिंह राव  
होंगे जिसका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद का उक्त  
औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्दिष्ट करती है?

अनुसूची

क्या कान्टिनेन्टल कन्ट्रक्शन (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड बाण बन्दरगाह  
परियोजना डाक-घर गान्धी ग्राम विशाखापत्तनम-530005 के प्रबन्ध-  
न का अपने निम्नलिखित 141 कर्मचारियों की सेवाएं समाप्त करना  
न्यायोचित है। यदि नहीं तो कर्मचारियों किस अनुसूची के हकदार हैं?

क्रम सं०	नाम	पदाभिधान	अनुभाग	नियुक्ति की तारीख
1	2	3	4	5
1	एम० बाबूराव	इम्पर प्रबालक	इम्पर अनुभाग	7-1-72
2	एम० सत्यप्रकाश	"	"	8-1-72
3	एम० धेकटराव	"	"	4-12-72
4	के० रामसू	"	"	10-11-71
5	ई० कोन्डल राव	"	"	21-2-72
6	पी० नागायणराव	"	"	22-2-72
7	पी० मिहाचरुम	"	"	21-2-72
8	एम० के० अन्वारी	"	"	21-3-73
9	एल० सुर्यनारायण	"	"	6-4-73
10	सी० एम० नायर	"	"	5-6-73
11	बी० ठाकुरदास	"	"	22-5-73
12	ए० के० विवाकरन्	"	"	22-5-73
13	ए० रामाराव	"	"	1-9-71
14	टी० अप्पना	"	"	2-9-71
15	एम० के० खालिसा	"	"	16-2-72
16	बी० मुखारगव	"	"	2-2-72

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
17. बी० टी० नायडू	इम्पर	इम्पर	1-4-71		63. बी० के० वर्गीज	बिजलीमिस्त्री	इम्पर	22-9-72	
	प्रबालक	अनुभाग			64. बी० जी० पणिकर	सहायक	अनुभाग	20-11-72	
18. बी० सत्यासी राय	"	"	21-3-72		65. एन० राधाकृष्ण पिल्लई	यान्त्रिक	"	19-10-71	
19. टी० आर० नारायणपिल्लई	"	"	15-10-72		66. एम० मुब्रह्मण्यम्	यान्त्रिक	"	4-10-71	
20. पी० थामस	"	"	21-2-72		67. डी० रामू	सहायक	"	2-11-71	
21. बाई० ए० नायडू	"	"	24-9-71			(हेल्पर)			
22. एम० रामू	"	"	22-3-73		68. के० लक्ष्मणराय	सहायक	"	15-9-73	
23. अब्दुल सत्तार	"	"	10-9-71			(हेल्पर)			
24. के० के० कृष्णा	"	"	28-11-72		69. सी० जे० वर्गीज	या/सहायक	"	10-11-71	
25. के० गंगा राजू	"	"	31-12-71			(हेल्पर)			
26. पी० अम्पा राव-IV	"	"	16-2-72		70. आर० परवेसी राव	हथौड़ेवाला	"	6-12-72	
27. एन० नूका राजू	"	"	27-12-72		71. पी० अम्पा	टार्प फिटर	"	1-1-72	
28. के० गोपीनाथ पिल्लई	"	"	10-10-72		72. एम० मोहन राव	खलाईगर	"	1-7-72	
29. के० गोपाल पिल्लई	"	"	21-3-73		73. टी० बी० अम्पा राव	यान्त्रिक	"	3 वर्ष	
30. जी० बैकट राव	"	"	9-3-72		74. गंगाधर पणिकर	सहायक	"	"	
31. यू० पेण्ट्रेया	"	"	11-11-71			(हेल्पर)			
32. जी० पोर्लेया	"	"	21-11-72		75. एस० अम्पाला राजू	सहायक	"	"	
33. एम० एल० नरसिंह राव	"	"	25-9-71			(हेल्पर)			
34. पी० बैकटराव	"	"	17-8-71		76. पी० बीरी बाबू	खराबी	कार्यशाला	23-9-71	
35. राम खिल्लावन	"	"	1-5-70				अनुभाग		
36. के० अम्पालास्वामी	"	"	4-1-72		77. पी० वाबू राव	"	"	1-11-71	
37. बालकृष्ण	"	"	6-11-72		78. गफ्फूर	"	"	25-5-73	
38. आर० बैकटस्वामी	"	"	28-9-72		79. एस० अम्पाला स्वामी	खलाईगर	"	2-1-68	
39. जी० रामू	"	"	24-3-71		80. के० प्रभाकरन् पिल्लई	"	"	15-9-71	
40. एम० बी० सत्यनारायण	"	"	10-10-71		81. ए० गोपीनाथ पिल्लई	"	"	8-12-71	
41. के० ए० नायडू	"	"	2-9-71		82. बी० राजू	"	"	25-11-71	
42. प्रभापी सिंह	"	"	7-10-71		83. जी० अम्पाराव	"	"	15-9-71	
43. जमवन्त सिंह	"	"	28-11-72		84. पी० अम्पाला रेड्डी	"	"	1-2-72	
44. मैयड मालिम शाह	"	"	21-2-72		85. बी० मोहन राव	लौहकार	"	20-9-72	
45. जी० परदेसी	"	"	28-3-73		86. एन० वैदेया	हथौड़ेवाला	"	1-10-71	
46. के० परवेसी राव	"	"			87. टी० अम्पाराव-1	"	"	1-2-72	
47. एन० अम्पाराव	"	"			88. के० अम्पाराव	खलामी	"	23-11-72	
48. बी० नारायण राव	"	"			89. के० मोहम्मद	"	"	1-2-73	
49. बाई० मोहन राव	"	"			90. ए० जोसेफ	फिटर	"	22-10-71	
50. कृपा राम	"	"			91. आर० बैकटराव	"	"	"	
51. सी०एम० अम्पाला स्वामी	"	"			92. बाई०के० विश्वनाथराव	सहायक	"	21-3-72	
52. बी० बी० रामन	"	"	15-2-72			(हेल्पर)			
53. पी० राममूर्ति राजू	"	"			93. साकी	"	"		
54. नरसिंह	"	"			94. जी० मुख्बाराव	"	"		
55. भजन सिंह	"	"			95. पी० एम० एम० एम०	भण्डारी	"	1-10-73	
56. ए० जी० पिल्लई	"	"			प्रसादराव				
57. पी० वैदेया	"	"			96. के० अम्पालास्वामी	भण्डार	भण्डार	11-5-72	
58. जे० एफी राजुलु	जीप चालक	जीप अनुभाग	5-9-71			सहायक	अनुभाग		
59. के० बैकटराव	"	"			97. एन० अम्पाराव	"	"	21-9-71	
60. बैकटरामन	"	"			98. जमपाल सिंह	खलामी	"	1 वर्ष	
61. बी० कोडलराव	यान्त्रिक	इम्पर	1-12-71		99. ई० के० रेड्डी	पर्यवेक्षक	शोबल	25-6-71	
		अनुभाग					(बेलचा)		
62. एन० रामू	सहायक	"	1-1/2 वर्ष				अनुभाग		
	(हेल्पर)				100. बी०के० धन्	"	"	18-11-71	
					101. जी० सत्यासी	पम्प सहायक	पम्प अनुभाग	8 वर्ष	

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
102. एम० नाथू	सहायक	विजली अनुभाग			136. एम० राजू	फिटर	"		
103. बी० अण्णाराव	मिकसर	—	3-9-73		137. के० एकम्बद्र राव	मान्त्रिक	डोजर		21-9-71
	प्रचालक					सहायक	अनुभाग		
104. नामसिंह	खलासी	"				(हेल्पर)			
105. कृष्णमूर्ति	लौहकार	डम्पर			138. बी० धार० नारायणराव	डम्पर	डम्पर		15-6-71
		अनुभाग				प्रचालक	अनुभाग		
106. पी० धार० वामुदेवन्	फिटर	धान-मापन	1-12-72		139. एस० के० मुकबूल	एम/एम	डम्पर		24-8-71
		संयंत्र					अनुभाग		
107. एम० सत्यनारायण	सहायक	धान-मापन	5-12-72		140. ए० सत्यनारायण	जीप चालक			20-11-69
	(हेल्पर)	संयंत्र			141. ए० साधु बाबू	टायर फिटर	डम्पर		1-4-71
108. एम० त्रिनाथराव	"	"	1-12-72				अनुभाग		
109. सत्यनारायण राव	"	"	4-12-72		[सं० एल०-34012/4/74-पी० बी०/सी० एम० टी०]				
110. एस० रामराव	"	"	10-12-72		धार कूजीवा पथम, अन्नर सचिव				
111. विजयकुमार	"	"	9-12-72		ORDER				
112. नन्ना खान	मान्त्रिक	"	10-10-70		New Delhi the 21st October, 1974				
113. नन्द गोपाल	मिकसर	"	30-11-71		S.O. 2879.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Continental Construction (Private) Limited, Visakhapatnam and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;				
	प्रचालक				And, Whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;				
114. जी० नरसिंह राव	सहायक	"	6-9-72		Now, Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri T. Narsing Rao shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.				
	(हेल्पर)				SCHEDULE				
115. विश्वनाथ कुरुप	फिटर	"			"Whether the management of Continental Construction Private Limited, Outer Harbour Project, Post Office Gandhigram, Visakhapatnam-530005 is justified in terminating the services of the undermentioned 141 of their employees. If not, to what relief are the employees entitled ?"				
116. बी० नरसिंह मूर्ति	लौहकार	"	6-9-72						
	सहायक								
117. के० ईश्वर राव	"	"			S.No.	Name	Designation	Section	Date of appointment
118. धार० सी० दास	कामप्रचालक	—	26-5-71		1. M. Baburao	Dumper Operator	Dumper Sec.		7-1-72
119. राम राज	"	—	3-9-71		2. M. Satya Prakash	"	"		8-1-72
120. बी० सन्यासी राव	"	—	8-9-71		3. M. Venskata Rao	"	"		4-12-72
121. सो० एच० प्रकाशराव	"	—	1-7-70		4. K. Ramulu	"	"		10-11-72
122. ए० वेमुडू	कामप्रचालक	—			5. E. Kondala Rao	"	"		21-2-72
123. बी० साधुराव	छेदक	—	1971		6. P. Narayanarao	"	"		22-2-72
124. ए० अच्युत बाबू	"	—	1971		7. Simhachalam	"	"		21-2-72
125. एम० सन्यासी राव	सहायक	—	1-10-71		8. S.K. Ansari	"	"		21-3-73
	(हेल्पर)				9. L. Suryanarayana	"	"		6-4-73
126. पी० मोदू नाथू	सहायक	—	9-3-71		10. C.S. Nair	"	"		5-6-73
	ब्लास्टर				11. B. Thakur Das	"	"		22-5-73
127. पी० नरसिंह राव	"	—	3-5-71		12. A.K. Diwakaran	"	"		22-5-73
128. पी० बापानैया	"	—	12-8-73		13. A. Ramarao	"	"		1-9-71
129. बी० अण्णाराव	होकर यांत्रिक	—	16-8-72		14. T. Appanna	"	"		2-9-71
130. एम० सत्यनारायण	सहायक	जेटी	5-12-72		15. S. K. Khalisa	"	"		16-2-72
	(हेल्पर)				16. V. Subba Rao	"	"		2-2-72
131. जी० चिरंजीवी	डम्पर	डम्पर	2-8-73						
	प्रचालक	अनुभाग							
132. अब्दुल जब्बार	यांत्रिक	"	3-9-73						
	सहायक								
	(हेल्पर)								
133. एम० बी० सत्यनारायण राजू	बलाईगर	सी-7	1-3-72						
134. के० राममोहन	फिटर	"	20-12-72						
135. जी० एच० सत्यनारायण	सहायक	"							
	(हेल्पर)								

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
17. B.T. Naidu	Dumper Operator	Dumper Sec.		1-4-71	72. S. Mohana Rao	Welder	Dumper Sec.		1-7-72
18. B. Sanyasi Rao	"	"		21-3-72	73. I. V. Appa Rao	Mechanic	"		3 Yrs.
19. T.R. Narayana Billai	"	"		15-10-72	74. Gangadhar Panikar	Helper	"		
20. P. Thomas	"	"		21-2-72	75. S. Appala Raju	"	"		
21. Y.A. Naidu	"	"		24-9-71	76. P. Veeri Babu	Turner	Workshop Sec.		23-9-71
22. S. Ramu	"	"		22-3-73	77. P. Babu Rao	"	"		1-11-71
23. Abdul Sattar	"	"		10-9-71	78. Gaffur	"	"		25-5-73
24. K. K. Krishna	"	"		28-11-72	79. S. Appala Swamy	Welder	"		2-1-68
25. K. Gangai Raju	"	"		31-12-71	80. K. Prakbhakaran Pillai	"	"		15-9-71
26. P. Appala Rao-IV	"	"		16-2-72	81. A. Gopinath Pillai	"	"		8-12-71
27. N. Nooka Raju	"	"		27-12-72	82. B. Raju	"	"		25-11-71
28. K. Gopinath Pillai	"	"		10-10-72	83. G. Appa Rao	"	"		15-9-71
29. K. Gopal Pillai	"	"		21-3-73	84. P. Appala Reddy	"	"		1-2-72
30. G. Venkata Rao	"	"		9-3-72	85. B. Mohana Rao	Blacksmith	"		20-9-72
31. U. Pentaiah	"	"		11-11-71	86. N. Pydiah	Hammerman	"		1-10-71
32. G. Polayya	"	"		21-11-72	87. T. Appa Rao-I	"	"		1-2-72
33. S.L. Narasinga Rao	"	"		25-9-71	88. K. Aparao	Khalasi	"		23-11-72
34. P. Venkata Rao	"	"		17-8-71	89. K. Mohammad	"	"		1-2-73
35. Rom Khilawan	"	"		1-5-70	90. A. Joseph	Fitter	"		22-10-71
36. K. Appalaswamy	"	"		4-1-72	91. R. Venkata Rao	"	"		
37. Bulakrishna	"	"		6-11-72	92. Y. K. Viswanatha Rao	Helper	"		21-3-72
38. R. Venkata Swamy	"	"		28-9-72	93. Saki	"	"		
39. G. Ramulu	"	"		24-3-71	94. G. Subba Rao	"	"		
40. M.V. Satyanarayana	"	"		10-10-71	95. P.S.S.S. Prasada Rao	Store Keeper	"		1-10-73
41. K. A. Naidu	"	"		2-9-71	96. K. Appalaswamy	Store Helper	Store Sec.		11-5-72
42. Prathapi Singh	"	"		7-10-71	97. N. Apparao	"	"		21-9-71
43. Ueswanth Singh	"	"		28-11-72	98. Jespai Singh	Khalasi	"		1 Yr.
44. Syed Malim Shah	"	"		21-2-72	99. F.K. Reddy	Supervisor	Shovel Sec.		25-6-71
45. G. Paradesi	"	"		28-3-73	100. B. K. Duttu	"	"		18-11-71
46. K. Pradesi Rao	"	"			101. G. Sanyasi	Pump Helper	Pump Sec.		8 Yrs.
47. L. Apparao	"	"			102. M. Naidu	Helper	Elec. Section		
48. V. Narayana Rao	"	"			103. D. Apparao	Mixer Operator	—		3-9-73
49. Y. Mohana Rao	"	"			104. Nam Singh	Khalasi	—		
50. Kripa Ram	"	"			105. Krishna Murthy	Blacksmith	Dumper Sec.		
51. Ch. Ananth Swamy	"	"		15-2-72	106. P. R. Vasudevan	Fitter	Batching Plant		1-12-71
52. V. V. Ramana	"	"			107. M. Satyanarayana	Helper	"		5-12-72
53. P. Ramamurthy Raju	"	"			108. K. Trinadha Rao	"	"		1-12-72
54. Nar Singh	"	"			109. Satyanaranaya Rao	"	"		4-12-72
55. Bhajan Singh	"	"			110. S. Rama Rao	"	"		10-12-72
56. A. G. Pillai	"	"			111. Vijayakumar	"	"		9-12-72
57. P. Pydiah	"	"			112. Nanna Khan	Mechanic	"		1-10-70
58. J. Ethel Rajulu	Jeep Driver	Jeep Section		5-9-71	113. Nanda Gopal	Mixer Operator	"		30-11-71
59. K. Venkata Rao	"	"			114. G. Narashinga Rao	Helper	"		6-9-72
60. Venkata Ramana	"	"			115. Viswanatha Kurup	Fitter	"		
61. Ve. Konalala Rao	Machinic	Dumper Section		1-12-71	116. D. Naraismhamurthy	Blacksmith Helper	"		6-9-72
62. N. Ramu	Helper	"		1½ Yrs.	117. K. Eswara Rao	"	"		
63. V. K. Varghese	Electrician	"		22-9-72	118. R. C. Das	Com. Operator	"		26-5-71
64. V. G. Panikar	Helper	"		20-11-72	119. Ram Raj	"	"		3-9-71
65. N. Rahakrishna Pillai	Mechanic	"		19-10-71	120. B. Sanyasi Rao	"	—		8-9-71
66. S. Subramanyam	Mechanic	"		4-10-71					
67. D. Ramu	Helper	"		2-11-71					
68. K. Lakshmana Rao	"	"		15-9-73					
69. C. J. Vergese	M/Helper	"		10-11-71					
70. R. Paradesi Rao	Hammerman	"		6-12-72					
71. P. Appanna	Type Fitter	"		1-1-72					



1	2	3	4	5
121	Ch Prakasa Rao	Com. Operator	Batching Plant	1-7-70
122	A Demudu	Com. Mechanic	—	—
123	B Sadu Rao	Driller	—	1971
124	A. Atchi Babu	—	—	1971
125	S. Sanyasia Rao	Helper	—	1-10-73
126	P. Modu Naidu	Asst. Blastre	—	9-3-71
127	P. Narasinga Rao	—	—	3- -71
128	P. Bapanaiah	—	—	12-8-73
129	D. Apparao	Dozer Mechanic	—	16-8-72
130	M. Satyanarayana	Helper	Jetty	5-12-72
131	D. Chiranjeevi	Dumper Operator	D Sec	2-8-73
132	Abdul Jabar	M. Helper	—	3-9-73
133	S. V. Satyanarayana Raju	Welder	C-7	1-3-72
134	K. Rammohan	Fitter	—	20-12-72
135	G. H. Satyanarayana	Helper	—	—
136	M. Raju	Fitter	—	—
137	K. Rukmandra Rao	M/Helper	Dozer Sec.	21-9-71
138	V. R. Narayana Rao	D/Op.	D/s	15-6-71
139	S. K. Makubul	S/M	D/s	24-8-71
140	A. Satyanarayana	Jeep Driver	—	20-11-69
141	S. Sadhu babu	Tyre Fitter	D/s	1-4-71

[No. L. 34012/4/74-PD/CMT]

R. KUNJITHAPADAH, Under Secy

र, दिना, 16 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2880—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के मन्त्रपुत्र श्रीम राजगोपाल मन्त्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 3848, तारीख 24 दिसम्बर, 1962, का, जहाँ तक इसका संबंध श्री पी० ए० नटराजन से है, अधिष्ठात करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री पी० ए० नटराजन का उक्त अधिनियम, स्कीम और उसके अधीन विरचित किसी कुटुम्ब पेंशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग में संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसकी एक से अधिक राज्यों में विभाग या शाखाएँ हैं, सम्पूर्ण आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य के लिए निरीक्षण नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० ए०-12016/10/74-पी० एफ०-1]

New Delhi, the 16th October, 1974

S.O. 2880.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 3848, dated the 13th December, 1962, in so far as it relates to Shri P. A. Natarajan, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. A. Natarajan, to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Andhra Pradesh for the purposes of the said Act, the Scheme and the family pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A-12016/10/74-PF. 1]

का० प्रा० 2881.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार सर्व श्री दुर्योधन प्रधान और गान्धिव चन्द्र छतोई को उक्त अधिनियम, स्कीम और उसके अधीन विरचित कुटुम्ब पेंशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग में संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसकी एक से अधिक राज्यों में विभाग या शाखाएँ हैं सम्पूर्ण उड़ीसा राज्य के लिए निरीक्षण नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० ए०-12016/1/72-पी० नि० 1]

S.O. 2881.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Sarvashri Duryodhan Pradhan and Govinda Chandra Chhattoi to be Inspectors for the whole of the State of Orissa for the purposes of the the whole of the State of Orissa for the purposes of the said Act, and the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A-12016/1/72-PF. 1]

का० प्रा० 2882.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार सर्व श्री एस० एन० देशपाण्डे और ए० टी० संत का उक्त अधिनियम, और स्कीम और उसके अधीन विरचित कुटुम्ब पेंशन स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी महापत्तन खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग में संबंधित किसी स्थापन के संबंध में या किसी ऐसे स्थापन के संबंध में जिसकी एक से अधिक राज्यों में विभाग या शाखाएँ हैं में सम्पूर्ण मध्य प्रदेश राज्य के लिए निरीक्षण नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० ए०-12016/19/73-पी० एफ० 1]

राम प्रसाद नरुला अवर सचिव

S.O. 2882.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Sarvashri S. N. Deshpande and A. T. Sant to be Inspectors for the whole of the State of Madhya Pradesh for the purposes of the said Act and the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one state.

[No. A-12016/19/73-PF. 1]

R. P. NARULA, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 1974

का० प्रा० 2883—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायय अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में नियोजक गठित नहीं श्री सी० बी०

खदान स्वामी अम्बोली हिल, अन्धेरी (पश्चिम) बम्बई के और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 2) बम्बई का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

"क्या श्री सी० बी० गुडिन्हो दान स्वामी अम्बोली हिल, अन्धेरी (पश्चिम) बम्बई की सर्वश्री, बासप्पा, शकरप्पा, रावप्पा, दुर्गप्पा, दुर्गप्पा पायप्पा, अन्नाबाई लक्ष्मण, बाबू, मिदप्पा और शाम राव मिदप्पा की सेवाएं समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो वे कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार हैं?"

[सं० एन०-29011/17/74-एन० आर०-1]

### ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th September, 1974

S.O. 2883.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employer, Shri C. B. Gudinho, Quarry Owner, Amboli Hill Andheri (West), Bombay and his workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of Shri C. B. Gudinho, Quarry Owner, Amboli Hill, Andheri (West) Bombay in terminating the services of Sarvashri Basappa San-karappa, Rawanna Durgappa, Durgappa Payappa, Chandrabai Laxman, Baboo Sidappa and Shamrao Sidappa is justified? If not, to what relief are these workmen entitled?"

[No. L-29011/17/74-I.R-IV]

### आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 25 सितम्बर, 1974

का० आ० 2884.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मेसर्स जयपुर उद्योग लिमिटेड, डाकघर फालोदी क्वारी, जिला सवाई माधोपुर के प्रबन्ध तन्त्र में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

### अनुसूची

"क्या मेसर्स जयपुर उद्योग लिमिटेड, डाकघर फालोदी क्वारी, जिला सवाई माधोपुर, (राजस्थान) की श्री धन्नालाल महायक पर्यवेक्षक को 1 जनवरी, 1969 से आकस्मिक वेल्डर के पद पर प्रत्यवर्तित करने और उसके पश्चात् उसे 7 अप्रैल, 1974 से पदच्युत करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार हैं?"

[संख्या एन०-29012/17/74-एन० आर०-4]

### ORDER

New Delhi, the 25th September, 1974

S.O. 2884.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Jaipur Udyog Limited, Post Office Phalodi Quarry, District Sawaimadhopur and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs Jaipur Udyog Limited, Post Office, Phalodi Quarry, District Sawaimadhopur (Rajasthan) in reverting Shri Dhannalal, Assistant Supervisor to the post of Casual Beldar with effect from the 1st January, 1969 and thereafter dismissing him from service with effect from the 7th April, 1969 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

[No. I-2912/17/74/LR-IV]

### आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 सितम्बर, 1974

का० आ० 2885.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में भारतीय खाद्य निगम, विजयवाड़ा में सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिनियम गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० नरसिंह राव होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा, और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

### अनुसूची

क्या भारतीय खाद्य निगम, विजयवाड़ा के प्रबन्धतन्त्र की श्री० एस० टी० पी० बी० एन० आचार्यलु, यूनिट सचिव, भारतीय खाद्य निगम कर्मचारी संघ, को 5 और 8 अप्रैल, 1974 को विशेष आकस्मिक छुट्टी मंजूर न करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है। यदि नहीं, तो वह किस अनुतोष का हकदार है।

[सं० एन०-42012/26/74/एन० आर०-3]

New Delhi, the 27th September, 1974

**S.O. 2885.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Food Corporation of India, Vijayawada and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri T. Narsing Rao shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Food Corporation of India, Vijayawada in not granting special casual leave on the 5th and 8th April, 1974 to Shri S.T.P.V.N. Acharyulu, Unit Secretary, Food Corporation of India Employees Union is justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. I. 42012/26/74/I R-III]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 30 सितम्बर, 1974

**का० प्रा० 2886**—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मैसर्स चतुराम दर्शनराम, अन्नक खान के स्वामी, डाकघर, मुमरीतेलैया, जिला हजारीबाग के प्रबन्धक से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वाछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अथ, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 11) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 3) धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स चतुराम दर्शनराम, अन्नक खान के स्वामी, डाकघर, मुमरीतेलैया, जिला हजारीबाग द्वारा नियोजित कर्मचारियों 1968, 1969 और 1970 में प्रारम्भ होने वाले वर्षों के दौरान अर्जित मजदूरियों के 20 प्रतिशत के हकदार है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मचारियों अर्जित वर्षों के लिए बोनस की किस मात्रा के हकदार है?

[संख्या एल०-28011/10/73-एल०आर०-4]

#### ORDERS

New Delhi, the 30th September, 1974

**S.O. 2886.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Chatturam Darshanram, Mica Mine Owners, Post Office Jhumritelaiya, District Hazaribagh and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 3), Dhanbad constituted under section 7 A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the workers employed by Messrs Chatturam Darshanram, Mica Mine Owners, Post Office Jhumritelaiya, District Hazaribagh are entitled to 20 per cent of earned wages during the accounting years commencing in 1968, 1969 and 1970? If not, to what quantum of bonus are the workmen entitled for the above mentioned years?

[No. L-28011/10/73-LR. IV]

**का० प्रा० 2887**—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में सेन्ट्रल बैंक आफ इण्डिया से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वाछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अथ, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 11) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एच० आर० सोधी होंगे जिसका मुख्यालय चण्डीगढ़ में होगा, और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या सेन्ट्रल बैंक आफ इण्डिया, चण्डीगढ़ के प्रबन्धक की, बैंक की अम्बाला छावनी शाखा के निपिक, श्री अमरीक सिंह की पदोन्नति न करने की कार्रवाई वैध और न्यायचित है? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस अनुतोष का हारा है?

[सं० एल०-12012/13/74-एल०आर०-4]

**S.O. 2887.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Central Bank of India and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri H. R. Sodhi shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters Chandigarh and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Central Bank of India, Chandigarh in denying promotion to Shri Amrik Singh, Clerk at Ambala Cantonment Branch of the Bank is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. I.-12012/13/74/I.R-III]

का० आ० 2888—यत केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि हमसे उपाययुक्त अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में ओरिएण्टल बैंक आफ कामर्स लिमिटेड, से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है।

और यत केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एच० आर० सोदी होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय चण्डीगढ़ में होगा, और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है?

#### अनुसूची

इस आग्रिगेटेड बन्धन आफ कामर्स लिमिटेड, नई दिल्ली द्वारा बैंक की राजधानी (जोड़) शाखा के लिफ्ट-मैन-नेकडिया श्री जे० आर० बदान की सेवाएं 6 जून, 1974 में समाप्त किए जाने की कार्यवाही के लिए और व्यापारिक है? यदि नहीं, तो वह किस अनुलोप के हकदार है।

[सं० एम्० - 12012/88/74-एल० आर० 3]

S.O. 2888.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Oriental Bank of Commerce Limited and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed,

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri H. R. Sodhi shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Chandigarh and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Oriental Bank of Commerce Limited, New Delhi in terminating the services of Shri J. R. Madan, Clerk-cum-Cashier at Rajoni (Jind) Branch of the Bank with effect from the 6th June, 1974 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. L-12012/88/74/LR-III]

नई दिल्ली, 19 अक्टूबर 1974

का० आ० 2889.—कोयला खान श्रम कल्याण निधि नियम, 1949 के नियम 6 के उप-नियम (1) के साथ गठित कोयला खान श्रम कल्याण निधि अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 32) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के मूलपूर्व श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1014, तारीख 6 मार्च, 1970 को अधिज्ञान करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को उक्त

अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन गठित कोयला खान श्रमिक आवासन बोर्ड के सदस्यों के रूप में नियुक्त करती है, अर्थात्—

(1) कोयला खान कल्याण-आयुक्त	अध्यक्ष
(2) महानिदेशक, खान सुरक्षा	सदस्य
(3) कार्यपालिका इन्जीनियर, कोयला खान श्रम कल्याण निधि	यथोक्त
(4) कार्यपालिका इन्जीनियर, धनबाद केन्द्रीय खनिकी बोर्ड	यथोक्त
(5) अध्यक्ष, झरिया खान स्वास्थ्य बोर्ड	यथोक्त
(6) अध्यक्ष, आसनसोल खान स्वास्थ्य बोर्ड	यथोक्त
(7) अध्यक्ष, हजारीबाग खान बोर्ड	यथोक्त
(8) श्री आर० वर्मा, प्रबन्धक—निदेशक, पूर्वी खण्ड, कोल माइन्स अथॉरिटी लिमिटेड	समाहकार समिति परामर्श से केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा नाम निर्दिष्ट सदस्य
(9) श्री जे० पी० दास, मुख्य इन्जीनियर नेशनल कोल डेवलपमेंट कॉर्पोरेशन	
(10) श्री बी० एल० करवण्डे, महाप्रबन्धक, सिगरेनी कोलरीज लिमिटेड	
(11) श्री श्री० महीपति, निदेशक (कामिक) भारत कांमिक कोल लिमिटेड, धनबाद	
(12) श्री दामोदर पाण्डेय, ससद सदस्य	
(13) श्री पी० के० प्रधान	
(14) श्री हिन नारायण सिंह	
(15) श्री शफीक खान	

[सं० एम्० 23018/3/73-एम० 11/एम० बी]

जी० सी० सखेसा अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th October, 1974

S.O. 2889.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 6 of the Coal Mines/Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1947 (32 of 1947) read with sub-rule (1) of rule 6 of the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund Rules, 1949 and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 1014, dated the 6th March, 1970, the Central Government hereby appoints the following persons to be the members on the Coal Mines Labour Housing Board constituted under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, namely:—

(1) The Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner	Chairman
(2) The Director General, Mines Safety	Member
(3) The Executive Engineer, Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund	-Do-
(4) The Executive Engineer, Dhanbad Central Division C.P.W.D., Dhanbad	-Do-
(5) The Chairman Jharja Mines Board of Health	-Do-
(6) The Chairman, Asansol Mines Board of Health	-Do-
(7) The Chairman, Hazaribagh Mines Board	-Do-
(8) Shri R. Verma, Managing Director, Eastern Division, Coal Mines Authority Limited	Members nominated by the Central Government in consultation with the Advisory
(9) Shri J.P. Das, Chief Engineer, National Coal Development Corporation Limited	
(10) Shri V.L. Karwande, General Manager, Singareni Collieries Limited	

- (11) Sri O. Maheswari, Director (Personnel)  
Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Dhanbad.  
(12) Sri D. nodar Fandor, Member of Parli-  
ament.  
(13) Sri P.K. Pradhan.  
(14) Sri H. narayan Singh.  
(15) Sri Shafique Khan.

Committee.

उक्त अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि का निकाल दिया जायेगा,  
अर्थात् —

“(92) श्री एल. रामचन्द्रा”

(संख्या एम-39012/1/74-एम-1)

New Delhi, the 15th October, 1974

[No. U-23018/3/73-MII/MV]  
G C SAKSENA, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 11 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० आ० 2890.—आन अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35)  
की धारा 94 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए  
और भारत सरकार के भूतत्त्व श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और  
रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 679, 23 फरवरी,  
1973 का अधिसूचना करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार नेल और प्राकृतिक गैस  
आयाम द्वारा सम्पूर्ण भारत में प्रत्येक आन्तरिक तेल खोज बचन और उत्पादन  
सक्रियताओं के लिए नियोजित किए गए व्यक्तियों का उक्त अधि-  
नियम के अध्याय 6 के उपबन्धों के उसकी धारा 36 और धारा 40  
में 46 तक (दोनों को सम्मिलित करने के लिए) तथा धारा 48 के सिवाय,  
प्रवर्तन में इन शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए छूट देती है, कि उक्त व्यक्तियों  
को, —

- (i) किसी भी दिन बारह घंटे से अधिक समय के लिए नियोजित  
नहीं किया जाएगा,
- (ii) एक समय में दो सप्ताह से अधिक की अवधि के लिए नियोजित  
नहीं किया जाएगा,
- (iii) एक समय में दो सप्ताह तक काम कर लेने के पश्चात् कम  
से कम एक सप्ताह की अवधि तक विश्राम दिया जाएगा।

[सं० एम० 29014/3/74-एम० आई०]

New Delhi, the 14th October, 1974

S.O. 2890.—In exercise of the powers conferred by  
sub-section (1) of section 83 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of  
1952) and in supersession of the notification of the Govern-  
ment of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation  
(Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 679,  
dated the 23rd February, 1973, the Central Government  
hereby exempts the persons employed by the Oil and Natural  
Gas Commission on exploration drilling and production opera-  
tions in every off-shore Oil Exploration Structure in the  
whole of India, from the operation of the provisions of  
Chapter VI of the said Act, except section 36 and sections  
40 to 46 (both inclusive) and section 48 thereof, subject to  
the conditions, that the said persons —

- (i) shall not be employed for more than twelve hours  
on any day,
- (ii) shall not be employed for more than two weeks at  
a stretch,
- (iii) shall, after they have worked for two weeks at a  
stretch be granted rest for a period of not less than  
one week.

[No. S 29014/3/74-MII]

नई दिल्ली, 15 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० आ० 2891.—आन अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35)  
की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए,  
केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत सरकार के भूतत्त्व श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना  
संख्या का० आ० 531, दिनांक 2 मार्च, 1961 में एतद्द्वारा निम्नलिखित  
और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् —

91 GI/74-10

S.O. 2891.— In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-  
section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of  
1952), the Central Government hereby makes the follow-  
ing further amendment in the notification of the Govern-  
ment of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employ-  
ment No. S. O. 531 dated the 2nd March, 1961, namely :—  
In the said notification, the following entry shall be omit-  
ted, namely :—

“(92) Shri I Ramachandra”.

[No. A 39012/1/74-MI]

नई दिल्ली 19 अक्टूबर, 1974

का० आ० 2892.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान है गया  
है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि सिक्युरिटी पेपर मिल होशंगाबाद  
जो कि औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की  
पहली अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट है उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए  
एक लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया जाना है,

अतः अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14)  
की धारा 2 के खण्ड (ड) के उपखण्ड (VI) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों  
का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा उक्त उद्योग को उक्त  
अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए तत्काल प्रभाव से छ मास की अवधि  
के लिए एक लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[सं० संख्या एम-11025/9/74—एल० आर०-1]

एम० एम० सहस्रनामान, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th October, 1974

S.O. 2892.—Whereas the Central Government is satis-  
fied that the public interest requires that the Security Paper  
Mill, Hoshangabad which is specified in the First Schedule  
to the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), should  
be declared to be a public utility service for the purposes  
of the said Act;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by  
sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial  
Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Govern-  
ment hereby declares with immediate effect the said indus-  
try to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said  
Act for a period of six months.

[F. No. S. 11025/9/74-LR.II]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 21 सितम्बर, 1974

का० आ० 2893.—यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे  
उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स ओरिएण्टल कोल  
कम्पनी लिमिटेड हाकर निर्माचट्टी जिला धनबाद की बादजना कोलरी  
(अब कोलमाइन्स प्रोपार्टी लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धधीन) के प्रबन्धसंज्ञ से  
सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद  
विद्यमान है,

और यत् केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए  
निर्देशित करना वाछनीय समझती है

अतः अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14)  
की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों

का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 2) धनबाद का न्यायनिर्णायन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

#### अनुसूची

- (i) क्या मैसर्स ओरिएण्टल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड डाकघर निसाचट्टी जिला धनबाद की बादजना कोलरी (अब कोलमाइन्स अथॉरिटी लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धाधीन) के प्रबन्धतल की श्री विनेशचन्द्र भारद्वाज बिजली-सहायक (हेल्पर) का कोयला मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिशों के अनुसार मजदूरी देने से इन्कार करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुसूच का और किस तारीख से हकदार है?
- (ii) क्या मैसर्स ओरिएण्टल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड डाकघर निसाचट्टी जिला धनबाद की बादजना कोलरी (अब कोलमाइन्स अथॉरिटी लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धाधीन) के प्रबन्धतल की श्री रमेशचन्द्र भारद्वाज अन्तर्भूमि (अण्डरग्राउन्ड) मुंशी का कोयला मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिशों के अनुसार मजदूरी देने से इन्कार करने और अन्ततः 25 नवम्बर 1972 से उन्हें काम से रोकने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो सम्बन्धित कर्मकार किस अनुसूच का हकदार है?

[सं० एल० 2012/13/73-एल० आर० 2]  
पी० आर० नयार, उप-मन्त्रि

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 21st September, 1974

S.O. 2893.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers

in relation to the management of Badjna Colliery of Messrs Oriental Coal Company Limited Post Office Nirshachatti, District Dhanbad (now under the management of Coal Mines Authority Limited), and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed.

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

- (i) Whether the action of the management of Badjna Colliery of Messrs Oriental Coal Company Limited, Post Office Nirshachatti, District Dhanbad (now under the management of Coal Mines Authority Limited) in denying the wages to Shri Dinesh Chandra Bhardwaj, Electric Helper as per Coal Wage Board recommendations is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled and from what date?
- (ii) Whether the action of the management of Badjna Colliery of Messrs Oriental Coal Company Limited, Post Office Nirshachatti, District Dhanbad (now under the management of Coal Mines Authority Limited) in denying Shri Ramesh Chandra Bhardwaj, Underground Munshi, the wages as per Coal Wage Board Recommendations and ultimately stopping him from work with effect from the 25th November, 1972 is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?

[No. L-2012/13/73-LRII.]

P. R. NAYAR, Dy. Secy.